

BOTTINI & BOTTINI, INC.
Francis A. Bottini, Jr. (SBN 175783)
Yury A. Kolesnikov (SBN 271173)
7817 Ivanhoe Avenue, Suite 102
La Jolla, California 92037
Telephone: (858) 914-2001
Facsimile: (858) 914-2002
E-mail: fbottini@bottinilaw.com
ykolesnikov@bottinilaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SEBASTIANO D'ARRIGO, on behalf of) No.
himself and all others similarly situated and)
derivatively on behalf of MARVELL)
TECHNOLOGY GROUP, LTD.,)
)
Plaintiff,))
vs.)
)
SEHAT SUTARDJA, JUERGEN GROMER,)
JOHN G. KASSAKIAN, ARTURO KRUEGER,))
RANDHIR THAKUR, PANTAS SUTARDJA,)
WEILI DAI, and DOES 1-20,)
)
Defendants,))
- and -)
)
MARVELL TECHNOLOGY GROUP, LTD.,)
)
Nominal Defendant.))

**CLASS AND SHAREHOLDER
DERIVATIVE COMPLAINT FOR:**

**(1) BREACH OF FIDUCIARY
DUTY;**
(2) UNJUST ENRICHMENT; and
**(3) BREACH OF THE DUTY OF
HONEST SERVICES**

CLASS ACTION

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff, by and through Plaintiff's attorneys, allege the following upon
 2 information and belief, except as to those allegations concerning Plaintiff, which are
 3 alleged upon personal knowledge. Plaintiff's information and belief is based upon, among
 4 other things, Plaintiff's counsel's investigation of publicly available information.

5 **SUMMARY OF THE ACTION**

6 1. This is a direct shareholder class action on behalf of shareholders of Marvell
 7 Technology Group, Ltd. ("Marvell" or the "Company"), and a shareholder derivative
 8 action on behalf of Marvell seeking to remedy wrongs committed by the Individual
 9 Defendants. During the relevant period, certain Marvell officers and directors violated
 10 state and federal law by breaching their fiduciary duties, engaging in fraud and dishonest
 11 conduct by willfully infringing federal patents held by Carnegie Mellon University,
 12 unjustly enriching themselves at the expense of the Company, and wasting corporate
 13 assets.

14 2. The Individual Defendants' conduct has damaged Marvell shareholders
 15 directly by jeopardizing and interfering with shareholders' rights to dividends. The
 16 defendants' conduct has also damaged Marvell by causing a judgment of \$1,169,140,271
 17 to be entered against Marvell and in favor of Carnegie Mellon University ("CMU") in
 18 federal court in Pennsylvania in December 2012. The federal court there made additional
 19 findings that the infringement was willful, thus entitling CMU to enhancement damages of
 20 up to three times the amount of the verdict. On March 31, 2014, U.S. District Judge Nora
 21 Barry Fischer in Pittsburgh, where CMU is based, increased the judgment to
 22 approximately \$1.54 billion to include such enhancement damages.¹ In her ruling, Judge

23
 24
 25 ¹ The total amount of the judgment, which includes the original judgment, the enhanced
 26 damages, and two years of post-judgment interest, was \$1,535,889,387.60. Such amount does
 27 not include any amounts which Marvell will be obligated to pay under the judgment for ongoing
 28 royalties.

1 Fischer said "enhanced damages" were justified against Marvell and its Marvell
2 Semiconductor unit because CMU showed that Marvell deliberately copied its patents
3 through "known willful infringement." The total judgment of approximately \$1.54 billion
4 is equal to 1.23 times the sum of the original \$1.17 billion jury verdict from December
5 2012, plus \$79.6 million for alleged infringements that the jury did not consider because it
6 had lacked recent financial information at the time.

7 3. In issuing the order for enhanced damages, Judge Fischer stated: "This
8 award is sufficient to penalize Marvell for its egregious behavior and to deter future
9 infringement activities."

10 4. The judgment has required Marvell to post a bond to secure the judgment.
11 Since the original judgment was entered, Marvell has filed multiple unsuccessful motions
12 to have the judgment set aside. In August 2013, Judge Nora Fischer denied Marvell's
13 motion for a mistrial. By order dated September 23, 2013, Judge Fischer denied Marvell's
14 motion for judgment notwithstanding the verdict.

15 5. Moreover, on February 24, 2014 Marvell filed the following Form 8-K with
16 the SEC disclosing that the CMU judgment has impaired or may impair its ability to pay
17 future dividends to its shareholders:

18 "On February 20, 2014, Marvell announced that it had declared the payment of its
19 quarterly dividend of \$0.06 per share to be paid on March 27, 2014 to all
20 shareholders of record as of March 13, 2014. Developments in the CMU litigation
21 could affect Marvell's ability to pay the dividend on March 27, 2014 under
22 Bermuda law, where Marvell is incorporated. In such event, the payment of the
23 dividend could be delayed until such time as Marvell can meet statutory
24 requirements under Bermuda law. The payment of future quarterly cash dividends
is subject to, among other things, the best interests of its shareholders, its results
of operations, cash balances and future cash requirements, financial condition,
statutory requirements of Bermuda law, and other factors that the board of
directors may deem relevant."

25
26
27
28

1 6. The CMU verdict has a high probability of materially and adversely
 2 affecting Marvell and its cash flows, including its ability to declare and pay dividends, as
 3 disclosed by the Company in its Annual Report filed on March 27, 2014:

4 “On March 6, 2009, Carnegie Mellon University (“CMU”) filed a complaint in
 5 the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania naming Marvel
 6 Semiconductor, Inc. and us as defendants, and alleging patent infringement. CMU
 7 has asserted U.S. Patent Nos. 6,201,839 and 6,438,180 (collectively, the “CMU
 8 patents in suit”), which relate to read-channel integrated circuit devices and the
 9 HDD products incorporating such devices. A jury trial began on November 26,
 10 2012. On December 26, 2012, a jury delivered a verdict that found the CMU
 11 patents in suit were literally and willfully infringed and valid, and awarded past
 12 damages in the amount of \$1.17 billion. ***Due to the finding of willfulness during***
 13 ***post-trial proceedings, the judge could enhance the damages by an amount up***
 14 ***to triple the damages awarded by the jury at trial. In addition, CMU has***
 15 ***disclosed in its post-trial motions that it is seeking pre-judgment interest up to***
 16 ***\$322 million, post-judgment interest, supplemental damages, attorneys' fees,***
 17 ***and an injunction and/or ongoing royalties.*** Post-trial motions were heard on
 18 May 1 and 2, 2013. On June 26, 2013, the District Court denied CMU’s post-trial
 19 motion for attorney fees without prejudice. On August 23, 2013, the District
 20 Court denied our motion for mistrial. On September 23, 2013, the District Court
 21 denied our motion for judgment as a matter of law or a new trial on non-
 22 infringement, invalidity and other non-damages issues as well as our motion for
 23 reduced damages. On the same day, the District Court granted-in-part CMU’s
 24 motion for a finding of willful infringement and enhanced damages, reserving its
 25 further rulings on any enhancement of the verdict for a forthcoming opinion. On
 26 January 14, 2014, the District Court denied our post-trial motion on laches. We
 27 believe that there are strong grounds for appeal and we intend to vigorously
 28 challenge the District Court’s judgment via an appeal to the U.S. Court of
 Appeals for the Federal Circuit in Washington, D.C., but there is no guarantee
 that we will be successful on appeal. Please see “Note 10 — Commitments and
 Contingencies” of our Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in
 Part II, Item 8 of this Annual Report on Form 10-K for a more detailed
 description of a number of litigation matters we are currently engaged in. Should
 the District Court in the CMU case grant an injunction or if we are required to pay
 most or all of the damages awarded by the jury after all appeals have been
 exhausted, ***this could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial***
condition, results of operations and cash flows.

2 We plan to appeal the final judgment issued by the District Court in the CMU litigation,
 3 regardless of the dollar amount of the final judgment. The parties are currently engaged
 4 in discussions before a Special Master concerning the bonding of the judgment pending
 5 appeal. During October 2013, we entered into indemnity agreements with a consortium of
 6 insurers that would potentially provide financial assurance that each of the insurers will
 7 be indemnified by us should a loss occur under a surety bond. As of February 1, 2014 and
 8

1 as of the date of this filing, no final judgment has been issued and no surety bond has
 2 been issued. Therefore, these indemnity agreements have had no impact to our
 3 Consolidated Balance Sheets as of February 1, 2014. We expect that under a surety bond,
 4 the surety companies would agree to guarantee to the District Court our payment of a
 5 specific amount, to be determined. However, the terms of any surety bond arrangements
 6 have not been finalized, and we cannot be certain that a surety bond will be available to
 7 us in sufficient amount to cover the full amount of a final judgment or on commercially
 8 reasonable terms. *If we cannot obtain a surety bond in sufficient amount or on
 5 commercially reasonable terms, or if the District Court in the CMU litigation does not
 6 approve alternative arrangements to stay execution of the judgment pending our
 7 appeal, our business could be harmed. For example, if, under a surety bond, we must
 8 post our cash, cash equivalents and short term investments as collateral, we may be
 restricted from using such assets in the operation of our business and such assets
 would be classified as restricted cash in future filings.”*

9 7. The CMU patents currently encompass all Marvell's HD chips and the per-chip
 10 royalty will result in roughly a 20% hit to operating margins on Marvell's HD controller
 11 business. Since the HD controller business makes up approximately 50% of Marvell's sales, the
 12 ongoing impact to earnings will be highly material, and could result in a 25% reduction in net
 13 earnings for Marvell as a whole going forward.

14 8. In addition to the CMU verdict, the defendants' willful violation of CMU's
 15 patents has further damaged Marvell by significantly increasing its legal expenses. As
 16 disclosed in Marvell's 2012 Annual Report, filed in March 2013: “General and
 17 administrative expense increased by \$7.9 million in fiscal 2013 compared to fiscal 2012.
 18 The increase was primarily attributed to an increase in legal expenses, a significant portion
 19 of which related to the CMU trial towards the end of the fiscal year.”

20 9. Throughout the Relevant Period (2003 through 2013), the Individual
 21 Defendants (as defined herein) caused the Company to issue false and misleading
 22 statements which failed to disclose several material adverse facts about the Company's
 23 business, operations, and prospects. Specifically, the Individual Defendants caused the
 24 Company to make false and/or misleading statements and/or fail to disclose: (1) that the
 25 Company was willfully infringing patents held by Carnegie Mellon University (“CMU”)
 26 that were very material to Marvell's business and revenues; (2) that, as a result, the

1 Company was exposed to very material and significant damages to CMU as a result of the
2 patent infringement; (3) that the Company lacked adequate internal controls; and (4) as a
3 result of the above, the Company's SEC filings were materially false and misleading at all
4 relevant times.

5 10. The Individual Defendants' misconduct has damaged Marvell and its
6 shareholders. Marvell has had a judgment of \$1.54 billion entered against it. Marvell will
7 have to pay future additional damages since the Judgment obligates Marvell to pay an
8 ongoing royalty on infringed chips sold by Marvell of \$0.50 per chip. With respect to
9 ongoing royalties, on May 1, 2014, Marvell and CMU filed a Joint Report with Judge
10 Fischer indicating that Marvell's sales of infringing chips during the period 11/03/13 –
11 02/01/14 was in excess of \$390 million.² Thus, Marvell is exposed to ongoing royalty
12 damages of at least \$195 million (as of February 1, 2014) in addition to the amount of the
13 Judgment itself. Marvell has incurred, or will incur, millions of dollars in costs and fees
14 due to defending itself in the CMU litigation. Additionally, the Company's goodwill and
15 reputation have been materially undermined and tarnished as a result of the CMU
16 litigation.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

18 11. Jurisdiction is conferred by 28 U.S.C. § 1332. There is complete diversity
19 among the parties and the amount in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000,
20 exclusive of interest and costs.

21 12. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because
22 Marvell maintains its principal executive offices in this district, one or more of the
23 defendants resides in this district, a substantial portion of the transactions and wrongs

² Marvell and CMU disagreed slightly on the exact sales figures. Marvell listed total sales during this time period of \$390,726,473, while CMU listed sales of \$392,029,138.

1 complained of herein—including the Individual Defendants' primary participation in the
2 wrongful acts—occurred in this district, and defendants have received substantial
3 compensation in this district by doing business here and engaging in numerous activities
4 that had an effect in this district. Marvell's conduct in infringing patents held by CMU
5 occurred in Santa Clara, California.

6 **PARTIES**

7 **Plaintiff**

8 13. Plaintiff Sebastiano D'Arrigo is an individual who currently owns 20,000
9 shares of Marvell common stock and has continuously held such stock since at least the
10 year 2000. Plaintiff is a citizen of France.

11 **Nominal Defendant**

12 14. Nominal Defendant Marvell is a Bermuda corporation with its principal
13 executive offices located at 5488 Marvell Lane, Santa Clara, CA 95054. Marvell's stock is
14 traded on the NASDAQ exchange under the ticker MRVL. Marvell is a fabless
15 semiconductor company which designs and develops a wide variety of integrated circuit
16 devices. Marvell has no employees located in Bermuda; all or substantially all its
17 employees and assets are located in California.

18 **The Individual Defendants**

19 15. Defendant Sehat Sutardja is the co-founder of Marvell and has been a
20 director and the Chairman and CEO of Marvell at all relevant times. Marvell represents
21 that Sehat Sutardja is technically sophisticated with respect to Marvell's technology and
22 that he "has been awarded more than 260 patents, recognized as the Inventor of the Year
23 by the Silicon Valley Intellectual Property Law Association and has been named a Fellow
24 of IEEE." Thus, Sutardja is an expert with respect to patents, the patent application
25 process, and the consequences for infringing patents. Marvell's website states the
26 following with respect to Sutardja: "As co-founder of Marvell Technology Group Ltd.,
27
28

1 Dr. Sutardja has served as Chief Executive Officer since its inception and President from
2 inception until July 2013. Dr. Sutardja has also served as Co-Chairman of the Board of
3 Directors from inception until 2003 and as Chairman of the Board since 2003. In addition,
4 he serves as President, Chief Executive Officer, and as a Director of Marvell's U.S.
5 operating subsidiary, Marvell Semiconductor, Inc. While remaining deeply involved in the
6 daily challenges of running a global growth company, Dr. Sutardja participates heavily in
7 Marvell's engineering and marketing efforts across analog, video processor, and
8 microprocessor design while offering input across all of the company's other product
9 lines." Before co-founding Marvell, Sutardja had worked at Micro Linear and Integrated
10 Information Technology, focusing on chips, digital circuits, and digital signal processors.
11 Sutardja holds Master of Science and PhD degrees in Electrical Engineering and Computer
12 Science from the University of California at Berkeley. He received a Bachelor of Science
13 degree in Electrical Engineering from Iowa State University. Upon information and
14 belief, Sutardja is a citizen of California.

15 16. Defendant Juergen Gromer has been, at all relevant times, a member of the
16 Board and has been since October 2007. Gromer serves as Chairman of Marvell's Audit
17 Committee and also serves on the Executive Compensation Committee and Nominating
18 and Governance Committee. Gromer is the retired President of Tyco Electronics Ltd., an
19 electronics company, a position which he held from April 1999 until December 31, 2007.
20 Dr. Gromer formerly held senior management positions from 1983 to 1998 at AMP
21 Incorporated (acquired by Tyco International in April 1999) including Senior Vice
22 President of Worldwide Sales and Services, President of the Global Automotive Division,
23 Vice President of Central and Eastern Europe and General Manager of AMP. Gromer
24 received his undergraduate degree and Ph.D. in Physics from the University of Stuttgart,
25 Germany. Upon information and belief, Gromer is a citizen of Germany.

26 17. Defendant John G. Kassakian has been, at all relevant times, a member of
27 the Board and has been since July 2008. Kassakian is a member of Marvell's Audit
28

1 Committee and also serves on the Executive Compensation Committee and Nominating
 2 and Governance Committee. Marvell represents that Kassakian, who holds a Ph.D., is an
 3 expert in the semiconductor field and states the following about him on the Company's
 4 website: "Kassakian has been a member of the faculty of Electrical Engineering and
 5 Computer Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology ("MIT") since 1973 and
 6 has served as Director of the MIT Laboratory for Electromagnetic and Electronic Systems
 7 from 1991 to 2009. Dr. Kassakian is the founding President of the IEEE Power Electronics
 8 Society, a member of the National Academy of Engineering, and is the recipient of the
 9 IEEE Centennial Medal, the IEEE William E. Newell Award, the IEEE Power Electronics
 10 Society's Distinguished Service Award and the IEEE Millennium Medal. Dr. Kassakian's
 11 expertise in the semiconductor field and academic experience related to the technology
 12 sector makes Dr. Kassakian a valuable contributor to our board of directors." Upon
 13 information and belief, Kassakian is a citizen of Massachusetts.

14 18. Defendant Pantas Sutardja is the brother of Defendant Sehat Sutardja, and is
 15 also one of the co-founders of Marvell. During the Relevant Period Pantas Sutardja was
 16 the Director, Vice President, Chief Technology Officer, and Chief R&D Officer at
 17 Marvell. Collectively, Pantas Sutardja and his brother and his brother's wife (Weili Dai,
 18 who serves as Marvell's Vice President and General Manager of Communications and
 19 Consumer Business) own and control approximately 19% of Marvell's stock.

20 19. Defendant Arturo Krueger is a director of Marvell and has been a director at
 21 all relevant times and since August 2005. Mr. Krueger is the Chair of the Board's
 22 Nominating and Governance Committee and is also a member of the Board's Audit
 23 Committee and Executive Compensation Committee. Mr. Krueger holds an MS in
 24 Electrical Engineering from the Institute of Technology in Switzerland and has studied
 25 Advanced Computer Science at the University of Minnesota. Marvell's website states the
 26 following about Mr. Krueger: "Mr. Krueger has more than 40 years of experience in the
 27 international semiconductor industry and acquired a wealth of experience in complex
 28

1 systems architecture, semiconductor design and development, operations, and international
2 marketing, as well as general management of a large company. Since his retirement in
3 February 2001, Mr. Krueger has been a consultant to automobile manufacturers and to
4 semiconductor companies serving the automotive and telecommunication markets and is
5 serving on several advisory boards. Prior to his retirement in 2001, Mr. Krueger had joined
6 Motorola in 1996 as a systems engineer and last served as Corporate Vice President and
7 General Manager of Motorola Corporation's Semiconductor Products Sector for Europe,
8 Middle East and Africa from January 1998 until February 2001. During his time at
9 Motorola, Mr. Krueger served as the director of the Advanced Architectural and Design
10 Automation Lab. Mr. Krueger brings a deep understanding of the modern semiconductor
11 industry, the complex world of microelectronic systems design and architectures, and the
12 financial aspects of running a large company.” Krueger currently also serves on the board
13 of QuickLogic Corporation, another semiconductor company. Upon information and
14 belief, Krueger is a citizen of California.

15 20. Defendant Randhir Thakur (“Thakur”) was, at all relevant times, a member
16 of Marvell’s Board of Directors. He is also a member of Marvell’s Nominating and
17 Governance Committee, the Board’s Audit Committee, and the Executive Compensation
18 Committee. Marvell’s website states the following concerning Dr. Thakur: “Dr. Randhir
19 Thakur is executive vice president and general manager of the Silicon Systems Group at
20 Applied Materials, Inc., which comprises the entire portfolio of semiconductor
21 manufacturing systems at Applied Materials. In this role, Dr. Thakur is responsible for
22 strengthening Applied Materials’ leadership in its core wafer fabrication equipment
23 markets. Since rejoining Applied Materials in May 2008, Dr. Thakur has served in various
24 executive positions, including senior vice president and general manager of the Display
25 and Thin Film Solar group, where he led the business offering manufacturing systems for
26 flat panel displays and Applied Materials’ thin film solar products. From 2005 to May
27 2008, Dr. Thakur worked at SanDisk Corporation, a supplier of innovative flash memory
28

1 data storage products, where he served as executive vice president of Technology and Fab
2 Operations and head of worldwide operations. From 2000 to 2005, Dr. Thakur held a
3 series of progressively advancing executive roles within various semiconductor product
4 groups at Applied Materials, including group vice president and general manager of Front
5 End Products. Prior to joining Applied Materials in 2000, Dr. Thakur served as chief
6 technology officer and general manager at Steag Electronic Systems, and vice president of
7 Research Development and Technology at AG Associates, and held various technical
8 leadership positions at Micron Technology. Dr. Thakur brings a wealth of experience in
9 the semiconductor and consumer electronics industry, while helping to grow new markets
10 and new products. We believe with his past and current experience in managing a large
11 customer-focused and innovation-driven organization and various aspects of operations
12 management and manufacturing, Dr. Thakur will be a valuable new addition to our board
13 of directors.” Dr. Thakur holds a BS with honors in Electronics and Telecommunications
14 Engineering from the National Institute of Technology, Kurukshetra, India, an MS in
15 Electrical Engineering from the University of Saskatchewan, Canada and a Ph.D. in
16 Electrical Engineering from the University of Oklahoma. Dr. Thakur holds close to 300
17 patents and has published more than 200 papers. Upon information and belief, Thakur is a
18 citizen of California.

19 21. Defendant Weili Dai is one of Marvell’s co-founders and served as Vice
20 President, Corporate Secretary and a Director of Marvell Technology Group Ltd. since the
21 company was established in 1995. She has also been a Director of Marvell Technology
22 Group Ltd. and Corporate Secretary of the Board. Since 1999, Ms. Dai has served as
23 Executive Vice President and General Manager of the Communications Business Group
24 and has been responsible for managing all of the Company’s communications product
25 lines. Ms. Dai has also served as Executive Vice President and a Director of Marvell
26 Semiconductor, Inc. since its inception. In 2006, Ms. Dai was named Chief Operating
27 Officer of Marvell. Effective July 14, 2013, Ms. Dai was named President of Marvell
28

1 Technology Group, Ltd. Prior to founding Marvell, Ms. Dai was involved in software
 2 development and project management at Canon Research Center America, Inc. Ms. Dai
 3 holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Computer Science from the University of California
 4 at Berkeley. Dai is a citizen of California.

5 22. The Defendants identified in ¶¶15-21 are sometimes collectively referred to
 6 herein as the “Individual Defendants.”

7 23. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or
 8 otherwise, of Defendants named in this action as Does 1-20, inclusive, are unknown to
 9 Plaintiff, who therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will
 10 amend this complaint to show their true name(s) and capacities when they have been
 11 ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of these
 12 fictitiously-named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein
 13 alleged, and that the nominal defendant’s injuries as herein alleged were proximately
 14 caused by conduct of these fictitiously-named defendants.

15 24. Because of their high-level positions with Marvell, each Individual
 16 Defendant directed the business of Marvell and had responsibility for, control of, and/or
 17 knowledge of the content and timing of all of Marvell’s press releases, public filings, and
 18 other public statements, including those described herein. Further, each Individual
 19 Defendant’s position gave him or her access to non-public information about Marvell’s
 20 business, finances, products, markets, and present and future business prospects. Each
 21 Individual Defendant also knew that the unfavorable facts specified herein had not been
 22 disclosed to the investing public and that the positive representations which were being
 23 made were both false and misleading.

24 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that at all
 25 relevant times herein mentioned, each of the defendants was the agent, principal,
 26 representative, and/or employee of each of the other defendants, and, in doing the things
 27
 28

1 mentioned herein, was acting within the scope of said agency, representation, and/or
 2 employment with permission of each co-defendant.

3 **CONSPIRACY, AIDING AND ABETTING, AND CONCERTED ACTION**

4 26. In committing the wrongful acts alleged herein, the Individual Defendants
 5 have pursued, or joined in the pursuit of, a common course of conduct, and have acted in
 6 concert with and conspired with one another in furtherance of their common plan or
 7 design. In addition to the wrongful conduct herein alleged as giving rise to primary
 8 liability, the Individual Defendants further aided and abetted and/or assisted each other in
 9 breaching their respective duties.

10 27. During all times relevant hereto, the Individual Defendants collectively and
 11 individually initiated a course of conduct that was designed to and did: (i) conceal the fact
 12 that the Company was willfully infringing patents held by CMU; (ii) maintain the
 13 Individual Defendants' executive and directorial positions at Marvell and the profits,
 14 power, and prestige that the Individual Defendants enjoyed as a result of these positions;
 15 and (iii) deceive the investing public, including shareholders of Marvell, regarding the
 16 Individual Defendants' management of Marvell's operations, the Company's financial
 17 health and stability, and future business prospects, specifically related to the Company's
 18 chips which infringed the process patents held by CMU. In furtherance of this plan,
 19 conspiracy, and course of conduct, the Individual Defendants collectively and individually
 20 took the actions set forth herein.

21 28. The Individual Defendants engaged in a conspiracy, common enterprise,
 22 and/or common course of conduct commencing by at least 2003 and continuing thereafter.
 23 During this time, the Individual Defendants caused the Company to conceal the true fact
 24 that Marvell was willfully infringing patents held by CMU that were material to Marvell's
 25 business.

26

27

28

1 29. The Individual Defendants accomplished their conspiracy, common
2 enterprise, and/or common course of conduct by causing the Company to purposefully,
3 recklessly or negligently refuse to license the CMU patents after CMU put Marvell on
4 notice of its patents beginning in 2003.³ After intentionally refusing to license the CMU
5 patents, Marvell then willfully infringed CMU's patents by incorporating CMU's process
6 patents into the technology for its products. Because the actions described herein
7 occurred under the authority of the Board, which to a certain extent relies on the
8 representations of the Company's officers, each of the Individual Defendants was a direct,
9 necessary and substantial participant in the conspiracy, common enterprise, and/or
10 common course of conduct complained of herein.

11 30. Each of the Individual Defendants aided and abetted and rendered
12 substantial assistance in the wrongs complained of herein. In taking such actions to
13 substantially assist the commission of the wrongdoing complained of herein, each
14 Individual Defendant acted with knowledge of the primary wrongdoing, substantially
15 assisted the accomplishment of that wrongdoing, and was aware of his overall contribution
16 to and furtherance of the wrongdoing.

DUTIES OF THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS

18 31. By reason of their positions as officers, directors and/or fiduciaries of
19 Marvell, and because of their ability to control the business and corporate affairs of
20 Marvell, the Individual Defendants owed the Company and its shareholders fiduciary
21 obligations of trust, loyalty, good faith, and due care, and were and are required to use
22 their utmost ability to control and manage Marvell in a fair, just, honest, and equitable
23 manner. The Individual Defendants were, and are, required to act in furtherance of the

25 ³ As alleged in more detail herein, Defendant Sehat Sutardja testified on 12/11/2012 at CMU's
26 patent infringement trial that he was aware of CMU's patents but declined to license CMU's
technology because Marvell was "not interested in using [CMU's] technology in our chip."

1 best interests of Marvell and its shareholders so as to benefit all shareholders equally and
2 not in furtherance of their personal interest or benefit.

3 32. Each director and officer of the Company owes to Marvell and its
4 shareholders the fiduciary duty to exercise good faith and diligence in the administration
5 of the affairs of the Company and in the use and preservation of its property and assets,
6 and the highest obligations of fair dealing. In addition, as officers and/or directors of a
7 publicly held company, the Individual Defendants had a duty to promptly disseminate
8 accurate and truthful information with regard to the Company's technology, patents,
9 revenue, margins, operations, performance, management, projections and forecasts so that
10 the market price of the Company's stock would be based on truthful and accurate
11 information.

12 33. The Individual Defendants, because of their positions of control and
13 authority as directors and/or officers of Marvell, were able to and did, directly and/or
14 indirectly, exercise control over the wrongful acts complained of herein, as well as the
15 contents of the various public statements issued by the Company. Because of their
16 advisory, executive, managerial and directorial positions with Marvell, each of the
17 Individual Defendants had access to adverse non-public information about the financial
18 condition, operations, and improper representations of Marvell.

19 34. At all times relevant hereto, each of the Individual Defendants was the agent
20 of each of the other Individual Defendants and of Marvell, and was at all times acting
21 within the course and scope of such agency.

22 35. To discharge their duties, the officers and directors of Marvell were required
23 to exercise reasonable and prudent supervision over the management, policies, practices
24 and controls of the financial affairs of the Company. By virtue of such duties, the officers
25 and directors of Marvell were required to, among other things:

26
27
28

(a) refrain from acting upon material inside corporate information to benefit themselves;

(b) ensure that Marvell did not infringe patents held by others;

(c) ensure that the Company complied with its legal obligations and requirements, including acting only within the scope of its legal authority and disseminating truthful and accurate statements to the SEC and the investing public;

(d) conduct the affairs of the Company in an efficient, business-like manner so as to make it possible to provide the highest quality performance of its business, to avoid wasting the Company's assets, and to maximize the value of the Company's stock;

(e) properly and accurately guide investors and analysts as to the true financial condition of the Company at any given time, including making accurate statements about the Company's technology, patents, financial results and prospects, and ensuring that the Company maintained an adequate system of internal controls such that the Company's financial reporting would be true and accurate at all times;

(f) remain informed as to how Marvell conducted its operations, and, upon receipt of notice or information of patent violations or imprudent or unsound conditions or practices, make reasonable inquiry in connection therewith, and take steps to correct such conditions or practices and make such disclosures as necessary to comply with patent laws and federal and state securities laws; and

(g) ensure that the Company was operated in a diligent, honest and prudent manner in compliance with all applicable federal, state and local laws, rules and regulations.

36. Each Individual Defendant, by virtue of his or her position as a director and/or officer, owed to the Company and to its shareholders the fiduciary duties of loyalty, candor, good faith and the exercise of due care and diligence in the management and administration of the affairs of the Company, as well as in the use and preservation of its property and assets. The conduct of the Individual Defendants complained of herein involves a knowing and culpable violation of their obligations as directors and officers of

1 Marvell, the absence of good faith on their part, a breach of defendants' duty of candor,
2 and a reckless disregard for their duties to the Company and its shareholders that the
3 Individual Defendants were aware or should have been aware posed a risk of serious
4 injury to the Company.

5 37. According to the Company, the primary role of the Board at the Company is
6 to oversee management by monitoring the performance of the CEO and other senior
7 executives and to ensure that the best interests of shareholders are being served. To satisfy
8 this responsibility, the Board is expected to take a proactive approach to its duties and
9 function as active monitors of corporate executives. Board members are required to
10 provide oversight in the formulation of the long-term strategic, financial and
11 organizational goals of the Company and of the plans designed to achieve those goals. In
12 addition, the Board oversees and reviews the standards and policies designed and
13 implemented by senior management to ensure that the employees and other constituents of
14 the Company are committed to achieving corporate objectives through the highest
15 standards of responsible conduct and ethical behavior and full compliance with legal
16 requirements.

17 38. In addition, the Audit Committee members owed specific duties because of
18 the added responsibilities of this Board subcommittee.

19 39. Each member of the Audit Committee is required to be, and in fact is
20 represented by the Individual Defendants as, financially literate and have the requisite
21 financial sophistication as required by the applicable listing standards of the Nasdaq Stock
22 Market.

23 40. The purpose of the Audit Committee, pursuant to its charter, is to "assist the
24 Board of Directors (the "Board") of Marvell Technology Group Ltd. (the "Company") in
25 fulfilling its responsibilities for oversight of the quality and integrity of the accounting,
26 auditing and reporting practices of the Company. The purpose of the Committee is to
27 oversee management's conduct of the Company's accounting and financial reporting

1 processes, including the review of financial reports and other financial information
 2 provided by the Company to its shareholders; reviewing the Company's systems of
 3 internal accounting, financial and disclosure controls and the annual independent audit of
 4 the Company's financial statements; and appointing, retaining and overseeing the
 5 performance of independent accountants."

6 41. The Audit Committee Charter states that the committee shall be responsible
 7 for the following tasks: "The following functions shall be the ***common recurring***
 8 ***activities of the Committee*** in carrying out its oversight function. These functions are set
 9 forth as a guide with the understanding that the Committee may diverge from this guide as
 10 appropriate given the circumstances:

11 ■ Review and discuss the Company's annual audited financial statements and
 12 quarterly financial statements with management and the external auditors, including the
 13 Company's disclosures under the section entitled "Management's Discussion and Analysis
 14 of Financial Condition and Results of Operations" in the Company's reports filed with the
 15 SEC and, with respect to the annual financial statements, the appropriateness and quality
 16 of accounting and auditing principles and practices as well as the adequacy of internal
 17 controls that could significantly affect the Company's financial statements;

18 ■ Review and consider with the external auditors the matters required to be
 19 discussed by Statement of Auditing Standards ("SAS") No. 61 and No. 90 and all other
 20 applicable standards and rules, as all may be amended from time to time, relating to the
 21 conduct of the audit, other significant financial reporting issues and judgments made by
 22 management in connection with the preparation of the Company's financial statements,
 23 and any other matters communicated to the Committee by the external auditors;

24 ■ Review disclosures made to the Committee by the Company's chief executive
 25 officer and chief financial officer during their certification process for Forms 10-K and 10-
 26 Q about any significant deficiencies in the design or operation of internal controls or

27
 28

1 material weaknesses therein and any fraud involving management or other employees who
 2 have a significant role in the Company's internal controls over financial reporting; and

3 ■ Review the independence and performance of the external auditors. With respect
 4 to the independence of the independent auditors, the Committee shall:

5 ■ Request from the external auditors annually, a formal written statement
 6 delineating all relationships between the auditor and the Company required by the Public
 7 Company Accounting Oversight Board;

8 ■ Discuss with the external auditors any such disclosed relationships and their
 9 impact on the outside auditor's independence; and

10 ■ Recommend that the Board take appropriate action to oversee the independence
 11 of the external auditors.”

12 42. Marvell's Executive Compensation Committee Charter states the following
 13 with respect to the purpose of the Committee and duties of its members: “The purpose of
 14 the Executive Compensation Committee (the “Committee”) of the Board of Directors (the
 15 “Board”) of Marvell Technology Group Ltd. (the “Company”) is to:

- 16 1. carry out the Board's overall responsibility relating to compensation of the
 17 Company's executive officers, as designated from time to time by the Company
 18 for purposes of Section 16 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended
 19 (the “Exchange Act”);
- 20 2. assist the Board in establishing the appropriate incentive compensation and
 21 equity-based plans for the Company's executive officers and to administer such
 22 plans;
- 23 3. produce an annual report on executive officer compensation for inclusion in the
 24 Company's annual proxy statement or annual report on Form 10-K; and
- 25 4. perform such other duties and responsibilities enumerated in and consistent
 26 with this Charter.

27 43. Marvell states that the following shall be “**the common recurring duties of**
 28 **the Committee** in carrying out its oversight functions. The duties and responsibilities are
 29 set forth below as a guide to the Committee with the understanding that the Committee

1 may alter or supplement them as appropriate under the circumstances to the extent
2 permitted by applicable law, regulation or Nasdaq Rule.

3 “The Committee shall:

- 4 1. Review and approve corporate goals and objectives relevant to the
compensation of the executive officers.
- 5 2. Evaluate the performance of the executive officers in light of such goals and
objectives at least annually and communicate the results to such officers and the
Board.
- 6 3. Based on the evaluation in 2. above, establish and approve annually for the
Chief Executive Officer and such other executive officers, the compensation
levels for those persons including, as applicable, (a) base salary, (b) bonus, (c)
long-term incentive and equity compensation, and (d) any other compensation,
perquisites, and special or supplemental benefits. In evaluating and determining
compensation for the Chief Executive Officer and such other executive officers,
the Committee shall consider the results of the most recent shareholder
advisory vote on executive compensation required by Section 14A of the
Exchange Act.
- 7 4. In determining the long-term incentive component of such executive officers’
compensation, consider, among other items, the Company’s performance and
relative shareholder return, the value of similar incentive awards to chief
executive officers and other executive officers at comparable companies, and
the compensation provided to each such executive officer in the past.
- 8 5. Establish and modify the terms and conditions of employment of the executive
officers, by contract or otherwise.
- 9 6. Determine the provisions of any contracts for the executive officers that will
govern the situation in which severance payments will be due upon change in
control situations.
- 10 7. Administer executive officer compensation in accordance with the terms of any
applicable Company compensation plans expressly drawn or adopted for such
positions.
- 11 8. On a regular basis, but not less than annually, the Committee shall report to the
Board on the Chief Executive Officer’s performance and compensation and the
compensation of the other executive officers. Deliberations and voting with
respect to the Chief Executive Officer’s compensation shall be conducted in the
absence of the Chief Executive Officer.

- 1 9. Review the Company's incentive compensation and other equity-based plans
and practices and recommend changes in such plans and practices to the Board.
- 2 10. Review the Company's benefit plans (including but not limited to 401(k),
employee stock purchase plan and bonus plans).
- 3 11. Administer the Company's equity incentive plans. In its administration of the
plans, the Committee may, pursuant to authority delegated by the Board, (i)
grant share options or share purchase rights to individuals eligible for such
grants and in accordance with procedures and guidelines as may be established
by the Board, and (ii) amend such share options or share purchase rights. The
Committee shall also make recommendations to the Board with respect to
amendments to the plans and changes in the number of shares reserved for
issuance thereunder.
- 4 12. Prepare the annual report on executive officer compensation that complies with
applicable law, including the Exchange Act, for inclusion in the Company's
annual proxy statement. Annually review and discuss the Compensation
Discussion and Analysis (the "CD&A") and related executive compensation
information with management, and, if appropriate, recommend to the Board
that the CD&A and related executive compensation information be included in
the annual proxy statement or annual report.
- 5 13. Perform an annual performance evaluation of the Committee.
- 6 14. To review and recommend to the Board for approval the frequency with which
the Company will conduct shareholder advisory votes on executive
compensation ("Say on Pay Vote"), taking into account the results of the most
recent shareholder advisory vote on frequency of Say on Pay Votes required by
Section 14A of the Exchange Act, and review and approve the proposals
regarding the Say on Pay Vote and the frequency of the Say on Pay Vote to be
included in the Company's proxy statement.
- 7 15. Perform such other activities and functions related to executive officer
compensation as assigned by law or the Company's Memorandum of
Association or Bye-Laws, or as may be assigned from time to time by the
Board.

22 The Committee shall ensure that compensation programs are designed to encourage
23 high performance, promote accountability and assure that employee interests are
24 aligned with the interests of the Company's shareholders."

25 44. Marvell's Nominating and Governance Committee has the following duties,
26 according to its Charter. "The following shall be the **common recurring duties of the**
27 **Committee** in carrying out its oversight functions. The duties and responsibilities are set

1 forth below as a guide to the Committee with the understanding that the Committee may
2 alter or supplement them as appropriate under the circumstances to the extent permitted by
3 applicable law, regulation or Nasdaq Rule.

4 The Committee shall:

- 5 1. Review and report to the Board on a periodic basis with respect to matters of
corporate governance (which is defined for this purpose as the relationships of
the Board, the shareholders and management in determining the direction and
performance of the Company).
- 6 2. Annually review and assess the effectiveness of the Board's Corporate
Guidelines and other policies essential to the sound and proper management of
the Company's business.
- 7 3. Be responsible for overseeing the Board performance evaluation process
including conducting surveys of director observations, suggestions and
preferences.
- 8 4. From time to time, conduct studies of the size and composition of the Board
and its committees, and periodically review with the Board and assess the
criteria and requirements for Board and committee membership including
without limitation, stock ownership requirements.
- 9 5. Assist in the recruiting of directors and recommend procedures for the
nomination process, and screen and recommend candidates for election to the
Board and to serve as members of committees, which may include new
directors for election by the shareholders and otherwise by appointment to fill
vacancies and newly created directorships.
- 10 6. Annually review and evaluate the nomination for re-election of current
directors.
- 11 7. Consider shareholder nominees for election to the Board.
- 12 8. In connection with the review and evaluation of potential directors,
periodically review the Company's Policies And Procedures For Evaluation Of
Director Candidates.
- 13 9. Oversee education and training programs for Board members.
- 14 10. Periodically review with the Chairman of the Board and the Chief Executive
Officer Company leadership roles, leadership development programs, and
succession plans relating to positions held by executive officers, and make
recommendations to the Board with respect to selection of individuals to
occupy those positions.

1 11. Periodically review director compensation for service on the Board and
2 recommend any changes in director compensation to the Board.

3 12. Be responsible for related party transactions as follows:

4 (a) The Committee shall review and approve policies and procedures with respect
5 to proposed transactions between the Company and related parties; and

6 (b) The Committee shall review and approve (including by ratification, if
7 applicable) all such related party transactions that would require disclosure
8 pursuant to the rules of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, and
9 other related party transactions required by Company policy to be reviewed and
10 approved.

11 13. Regularly report on Committee activities to the Board.

12 In performing its duties hereunder, the Committee will endeavor to comply with
13 applicable legal requirements, including but not limited to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act
14 of 2002, federal securities laws and the Nasdaq Rules.”

SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

I. BACKGROUND

15 45. Marvell was founded in 1995 by brothers Sehat and Pantas Sutardja and
16 Sehat’s wife, Weili Dai. Defendant Dai allegedly picked the name for the company and
17 based it on a diminution of the word “marvelous.”

18 46. Marvell is a fabless semiconductor company which designs and develops a
19 wide variety of integrated circuit devices. The Company states in its annual reports that it
20 “is a fabless semiconductor provider of high-performance application-specific standard
21 products (ASSPs). Our core strength of expertise is the development of complex System-
22 on-a-Chip (SoC) devices leveraging our extensive portfolio of intellectual property (IP) in
23 the areas of analog, mixed-signal, digital signal processing and embedded ARM-based
24 microprocessor integrated circuits. Our product portfolio includes devices for data storage,
25 enterprise-class Ethernet data switching, Ethernet physical-layer transceivers, handheld
26 cellular, Ethernet-based wireless networking, personal area networking, Ethernet-based PC
27 connectivity, control plane communications controllers, video-image processing and

1 power management solutions. Our products serve diverse applications used in carrier,
 2 metropolitan, enterprise and PC-client data communications and storage systems.
 3 Additionally, we serve the market for the convergence of voice, video and data
 4 applications in the consumer electronics market.”⁴

5 47. Marvell’s major customers include Fujitsu, Hitachi, IBM, Maxtor, Samsung,
 6 Seagate Technology, Toshiba, and Western Digital. Before such customers order
 7 semiconductor chips from Marvell, they engage in a lengthy evaluation and
 8 implementation process, all of which occurs at Marvell’s Santa Clara, California
 9 headquarters.

10 **II. THE ONCE AND FUTURE KING AND QUEEN OF MARVELL:
 11 DEFENDANTS SUTARDJA AND DAI’S HISTORY OF SELF-DEALING
 12 AND DISHONESTY, BLESSED AND APPROVED BY A SUPINE BOARD**

13 48. This action involves the defendants’ dishonesty and lack of candor with
 14 respect willful infringement of patents held by Carnegie Mellon University (“CMU”).
 15 Defendants’ wrongdoing in this regard has caused Marvell to be damaged in excess of
 16 \$1.54 billion, while the Individual Defendants named herein have benefitted themselves
 17 financially by tens of millions of dollars.

18 49. A review of defendants’ past wrongdoing at Marvell is illuminating to
 19 demonstrate defendants’ pattern and practice of breaching their fiduciary duties in a willful
 20 and dishonest manner to benefit themselves financially at the expense of Marvell and its
 21 public, minority shareholders. Defendants’ past and current conduct constitutes a fraud on
 22 the minority shareholders, as that term is understood under Bermuda law.

23 50. In 2006, the same year Defendant Dai was named COO, Marvell received a
 24 letter of informal inquiry from the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) requesting
 25 certain documents relating to the company’s stock option grants and practices.

26 ⁴ This quotation is taken from Marvell’s 2008 Annual Report on Form 10-K, at p. 4.
 27
 28

1 51. At Marvell, the same day the SEC probe was announced, the U.S. Attorney's
 2 office in San Francisco served the company with a grand jury subpoena for stock options
 3 records. Ten months later, on May 7, 2007, a two-person Special Committee appointed by
 4 Marvell's board to investigate the company's practices concluded that Marvell had
 5 backdated options and that Sutardja had participated in the backdating in some cases.

6 52. In a typical backdating scheme, directors or executives granted options at the
 7 then current stock price. Later, they cherry-picked a time from the past when the price was
 8 lower, calling that the grant date, to boost the value of the shares. Backdating violates
 9 federal securities laws if companies fail to account for options paid to employees, as
 10 Marvell failed to do. On May 7, 2007, Marvell said it would restate its financial results by
 11 as much as \$350 million. The ultimate amount of the restatement ended up being \$327
 12 million.

13 53. Backdating is a bald-faced lie, represents *ultra vires* conduct, and constitutes
 14 a breach of the duty of candor.

15 54. "‘The Special Committee found a systemic failure of internal controls,’"
 16 Marvell said in an SEC filing at the time. Marvell stock, which had climbed to a split-
 17 adjusted record \$35.32 on Jan. 27, 2006, plunged 53 percent to \$16.37 on May 21, 2007,
 18 destroying more than \$10 billion in market value.

19 55. Marvell’s Special Committee, after concluding that Marvell’s executives and
 20 directors had backdated options, recommended several remedial actions, including
 21 stripping Defendant Sehat Sutardja (the CEO of Marvell) of his Chairman duties and
 22 terminating the services of Ms. Dai, who was said to bear a certain amount “of
 23 responsibility for these deficiencies.” The Board ignored these decisions, choosing instead
 24 to “demote” Ms. Dai and to appoint an independent lead director (temporarily) instead of
 25 reducing the CEO’s control of the board.

26 56. The fact that the husband/wife duo of Defendants Sehat Sutardja and Weili
 27 Dai ignored governance changes recommended by the allegedly independent Board
 28

1 members, despite their highly unethical and unlawful behavior, amply demonstrates that
 2 Sutardja and Dai exercise unfettered control of Marvell's operations. Such domination
 3 and control of Marvell's Board by Sutardja and Dai persists to this day.

4 57. Both shareholder lawsuits and news articles at the time noted that from
 5 2001 to 2006, Defendants Sehat Sutardja and Ms. Dai (along with fellow officers and
 6 directors) received ***more than \$760 million from the sale of 36 million Marvell shares,***
 7 ***most of which were backdated.***⁵ As a Bloomberg article noted, "In a setup that differs
 8 from that at most companies, Sutardja and Dai were the sole members of the committee
 9 that doled out options. It's unusual to have a married couple occupying the senior
 10 executive positions in a company, let alone allow them to be in charge of handing out
 11 stock-based compensation."⁶

12 58. Defendant Dai has been reported to order Italian designer furniture from
 13 Gianni Versace for Marvell's lobby, and for herself a red Ferrari F430 with a custom
 14 license plate reading "Marvell."

15 59. In response to the enormous self-dealing by defendants with respect to
 16 backdating of stock options at Marvell, shareholders filed a shareholder derivative action
 17 in this Court on November 1, 2006. On March 20, 2009, the case was settled and a
 18 Stipulation of Settlement was filed with the Court. The defendants paid \$54,994,726 to
 19 settle the case, plus additional corporate governance changes. Defendants in that case
 20 included some of the defendants named herein, including Sehat and Pantas Sutardja, Weili
 21 Dai, and Arturo Krueger. Defendant Gromer filed a declaration in support of the
 22 settlement, stating that he and Defendant Kassakian had approved the settlement.

23
 24
 25 ⁵ See, e.g., "Billionaires from Jakarta, Shanghai Undermined by Options," BLOOMBERG, May 21,
 26 2007.

27
 28 ⁶ *Id.*

1 60. Similar wrongdoing involving backdating of stock options at Marvell, and
 2 lying to shareholders about it, gave rise to a shareholder class action lawsuit, also filed in
 3 this Court. Marvell was damaged in that case, which ended up settling for \$72 million.
 4 Judge Whyte entered final judgment on November 13, 2009.

5 61. Defendant Dai also entered into a settlement with the SEC in which she
 6 consented to a permanent injunction against any future violations of various provisions of
 7 the federal securities laws, agreed not to serve as a director or officer of a public company
 8 for a period of five years, and paid a civil penalty of \$500,000. According to the WALL
 9 STREET JOURNAL, the SEC said the size of the fines “partly reflect that the company didn’t
 10 follow the recommendation to fire her. According to the SEC’s complaint, Ms. Dai didn’t
 11 cooperate with the agency’s investigators and invoked her Fifth Amendment right against
 12 self-incrimination when asked ‘substantive questions’ by SEC staff.”

13 62. Despite the settlement and her five-year ban on serving as an executive
 14 officer, Defendant Dai continued to be generously compensated. Immediately after her
 15 “resignation” in 2007, she received an enormous options grant of 6,888,798 shares in
 16 2007. In 2008, she again received a second outsized grant of 7,387,067 options. In 2007
 17 and 2008, she received total compensation from Marvell of 7,380,600 and 7,672,111,
 18 respectively.

19 63. In 2012, Dai received the following compensation package approved by the
 20 company’s Audit Committee and Executive Compensation Committee:

- 21 1. a \$400,000 bonus;
- 22 2. an increase in her annual base salary to \$510,000 (from 500,000);
- 23 3. a bonus participation target for Ms. Dai equal to 80% of her base pay;
- 24 4. a mega-grant of 800,000 options with service-based vesting; and
- 25 5. a grant of 80,000 restricted stock units with service-based vesting.

26 64. Altogether, Defendant Dai received 2012 compensation of approximately \$6
 27 million, an amount that makes her the second highest paid named executive officer (NEO)
 28

1 at Marvell, if she were allowed to be called an “executive.” This represented self-dealing
 2 conduct countenanced and approved by the Compensation Committee (Defendants
 3 Gromer, Kassakian, Thakur and Krueger), who approved compensation to Dai
 4 commensurate with that of an executive officer during the time that Dai was banned by her
 5 settlement with the SEC from serving as an executive officer of Marvell.

6 65. Unsurprisingly, as soon as Dai’s five-year ban from serving as an executive
 7 officer of Marvell expired, the Board promptly named Dai President of the Company,
 8 effective July 14, 2013. The king and queen were back on their thrones.

9 66. As part of the stock option backdating scandal at Marvell, the Company’s
 10 own General Counsel alleged in a whistleblower lawsuit that both Defendants Sehat
 11 Sutardja and Arturo Krueger pressured him to lie. *See Matthew Gloss v. Marvell*
 12 *Semiconductor, Inc. and Marvell Technology Group, Ltd.*, Case No. 2009-SOX-00011
 13 (U.S. Dept. of Labor, Office of Administrative Law Judges, San Francisco, CA). In
 14 declarations submitted under penalty of perjury, Marvell’s former General Counsel
 15 Matthew Gloss stated that on the evening of October 25, 2006, the day before he was
 16 scheduled to have his third interview with the Special Committee which had been
 17 appointed to investigate the stock option backdating at Marvell, Defendant Sehat Sutardja
 18 called him at his home in an apparent effort to influence his testimony. Gloss Decl. ¶ 3.
 19 CEO Sutardja also indicated that he could not attest to the accuracy of certain records from
 20 Stock Options Committee meetings with Chief Operating Officer Weili Dai ("COO Dai").
 21 *Id.* Gloss also stated in his sworn declaration that, on October 26, 2006, he mentioned the
 22 phone call with CEO Sutardja during his interview with Special Committee's counsel
 23 Matthew Jacobs. *Id.* Gloss alleges that following the interview, Defendant Krueger
 24 reprimanded him for disclosing the phone call with CEO Sutardja to Jacobs. Gloss Decl. ¶
 25 4. Gloss further stated that Krueger suggested that he should have lied about the nature of
 26 the phone call with CEO Sutardja. *Id.*

27
 28

1 67. In his declaration, Gloss further stated that he reported both the Sutardja
 2 phone call and the Krueger conversation to Marvell's Chief Financial Officer George
 3 Hervey ("CFO Hervey") and Vice President of World Wide Human Resources Michelle
 4 Oakes in early November 2006. Gloss Decl., ¶ 5. He also stated he discussed the matter
 5 with Doug King, Chair of the company's Audit Committee in mid-January, 2007. Gloss
 6 Decl., ¶ 7. On February 7, 2007, Gloss met with King a second time, providing him with a
 7 letter questioning Krueger's independence on the Special Committee. Gloss expressed
 8 similar concerns in a document he submitted to the SEC the following day. Gloss Decl., ¶
 9 8.

10 68. Gloss' declaration further stated that Gloss reiterated his concerns about the
 11 independence of the Special Committee during his final interview with Jacobs on February
 12 13, 2007. Gloss Decl., ¶ 9. In response to Gloss's allegations, Marvell asked King to
 13 conduct an investigation. King hired retired Federal Judge Abraham Sofaer to assist with
 14 the investigation. Judge Sofaer, in turn, hired outside counsel to aid him in his task. *Id.*

15 69. As a result of Gloss's allegations, Marvell delayed the Special Committee's
 16 investigation. Gloss stated that, as a result of his complaints, his responsibilities as
 17 General Counsel were curtailed in November 2006 and transferred to a junior attorney.
 18 Gloss Decl. ¶ 6. He further stated in his declaration that, on March 26, 2007, he was
 19 terminated without explanation and barred from his office. Gloss Decl. ¶ 6.

20 70. Gloss filed a whistleblower lawsuit under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, claiming
 21 that his termination was in retaliation for his reports of unlawful conduct by Marvell's
 22 executives, including Sehat Sutardja, Weili Dai, and Arturo Krueger. The lawsuit was
 23 subsequently dismissed by the Administrative Law Judge in an opinion dated June 24,
 24 2009 on statute of limitations grounds since Gloss had filed his lawsuit more than 90 days
 25 following his termination, which shortened period Marvell had apparently forced Gloss to
 26 agree to when he started working at Marvell.

27
 28

1 71. In addition to backdating stock options, the Defendants have been alleged to
 2 have engaged in substantial wrongdoing in litigation involving intellectual property.

3 **III. THE DEFENDANTS' HISTORY OF ALLEGED THEFT OF INTELLECTUAL
 4 PROPERTY**

5 72. In April 2001, Marvell started talks to acquire telecommunications chip
 6 technology from Jasmine Networks Inc., a San Jose-based competitor. As the companies
 7 were negotiating, Marvell executives were conspiring with some of Jasmine's senior
 8 managers to steal its trade secrets, a breach of contract lawsuit Jasmine filed in September
 9 2001 in Santa Clara County Superior Court alleged. The suit sought \$40 million in
 10 damages from Marvell. In a cross-complaint in 2005, Marvell rejected Jasmine's
 11 allegations. Marvell alleged that Jasmine itself had stolen the technology and had
 12 fraudulently misrepresented it as its own. In its lawsuit, Jasmine contended that Alba
 13 directed Marvell's action with the support of Sehat Sutardja.

14 73. Jasmine's key evidence was a recorded conversation of Marvell General
 15 Counsel Matthew Gloss, Vice President Kaushik Banerjee and in-house patent attorney
 16 Eric Janofsky on Aug. 16, 2001.

17 74. The three men had called Jasmine lawyer Virginia Wei and got a voice mail
 18 greeting. Forgetting to hang up, the men discussed the legal peril of Marvell's dealings
 19 with Jasmine. Their conversation was captured on Wei's voice mail system. Gloss said,
 20 ``Sehat doesn't go to jail, obviously" according to a transcript published in a California
 21 appellate opinion written by Presiding Justice Conrad Rushing in 2004. Referring to Alba,
 22 Gloss says, ``Manuel might go to jail; Manuel gets a black eye." Later, Janofsky says, ``If
 23 we took that IP on the pretense of just evaluating it and put it in our product?"

24 75. Justice Rushing found the remark about intellectual property showed
 25 Marvell executives were discussing fraud. His ruling overturned a lower court order that
 26 had barred Jasmine from using the recording. After proceeding in appellate court, the case

1 was remanded to Superior Court for trial. A jury eventually ruled in Marvell's favor, and
 2 Jasmine appealed.

3 **IV. THE DEFENDANTS CAUSE MARVELL TO WILLFULLY INFRINGE**
 4 **PATENTS OWNED BY CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY**

5 76. During the relevant time period, Carnegie Mellon University ("CMU")
 6 owned valuable patents that Marvell willfully infringed, resulting in a jury awarding a
 7 verdict against Marvell and in CMU's favor in December 2012 for \$1,169,140,27.⁷ On
 8 March 31, 2014, the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania
 9 enhanced that judgment to approximately \$1.54 billion based on findings that Marvell
 10 willfully infringed CMU's patents.

11 77. The patents which Marvell willfully infringed were critical to Marvell's
 12 business. The jury made findings of fact that Marvell sold 2.34 billion chips which had
 13 technology based on the infringed patents between March 6, 2003 and July 28, 2012. The
 14 average revenue for Marvell of such chips was \$4.42, and the average profit per chip was
 15 \$2.16.

16 78. Because of the critical nature of the patents to Marvell's business, the
 17 decision with respect to the infringement of CMU's patents were made by the defendants
 18 named herein – the controlling directors and executives of Marvell, who are all extremely
 19 knowledgeable about patents and patent law and several of whom have personally
 20 registered hundreds of patents. They acted intentionally, willfully, and in a dishonest
 21 manner with respect to the infringement of CMU's patents, and their conduct has caused
 22 Marvell and its shareholders to be damaged in an amount in excess of \$1.54 billion. Their
 23 conduct has further infringed rights personal to Marvell's shareholders since the

24
 25
 26 ⁷ *Carnegie Mellon University v. Marvell Technology Group, Ltd.*, Case No. 09-cv-00290 (W.D.
 27 Pa.).
 28

1 defendants' wrongdoing has interfered with Marvell's ability to declare and pay dividends
 2 to Plaintiff and the other Marvell shareholders.

3 79. Marvell knew about CMU's patents beginning at least in 2002. One of the
 4 important engineers at Marvell who worked on the relevant technology was Gregory Burd,
 5 who had joined Marvell in 1999. In January 2002, Burd sent two emails to Toai Doan,
 6 who was then his boss at Marvell. Doan was a manager and principal engineer of signal
 7 processing at Marvell and later Vice President of read channel development. In his
 8 January 2002 email to Doan, Burd told Doan that CMU owned patents to the technology
 9 Marvell was interested in and working on, which was referred to as the "Kavcic method"
 10 after its inventor of the same name (Dr. Kavcic) from CMU. One of Burd's acting
 11 managers at Marvell was also Dr. Nersi Nazari. Nazari was Dr. Kavcic's main contact at
 12 Marvell.

13 80. Further, in August 2003, CMU's Technology Transfer representative Carl
 14 Mahler sent a letter to Defendant Pantas Sutardja and to Marvell's General Counsel,
 15 Matthew Gloss, inquiring as to whether Marvell would be interested in licensing the
 16 relevant patents owned by CMU – the '180 and '839 patents.⁸ CMU stated in the letter
 17 that "I have taken the liberty of including copies of these patents along with this letter" and
 18 indicated "I would be happy to work with you to negotiate a license to these patents if that
 19 would be of interest to you."

20 81. Mahler had sent the same letter at the same time to Fujitsu. Thus, Fujitsu
 21 was also on notice of CMU's patents in this area. Fujitsu was one of Marvell's customers
 22 in the read channel area, and thus became concerned about CMU's patents because it
 23 perceived Marvell's products to contain the same technology covered by CMU's patents
 24 disclosed by CMU in Mahler's letter. As a result, in November 2004 Fujitsu employee

25
 26 ⁸ The full name of the patents is US Patent No. 6,201,839 B1 and US Patent No. 6,438,180 B1.
 27
 28

1 Junya Suwanai wrote a letter to Marvell, noting that Fujitsu had received Mahler's August
 2 2003 letter offering to license CMU's patented technology and asking Marvell whether its
 3 products infringed on CMU's patents. Fujitsu asked for a response from Marvell by the
 4 end of the month. It is not known whether Marvell ever responded (at least in writing) to
 5 Fujitsu's letter, but the record from the proceedings in CMU's subsequent patent
 6 infringement case in Pittsburgh indicates that Marvell did not produce any responsive
 7 letters.

8 82. Thus, beginning at least 2002, Marvell had actual knowledge of CMU's
 9 patents and intellectual property, and was given an opportunity to license the patents.

10 83. In CMU's patent infringement trial, CMU was required to prove that
 11 Marvell had the specific intent to encourage others to infringe CMU's patents, which can
 12 be demonstrated if Marvell caused, urged, encouraged, or aided the infringing conduct.
 13 On this point, the Court found that CMU introduced sufficient evidence at trial that
 14 Marvell aided its customers' infringement by producing chips that used the accused
 15 methods and instructed its customers to use the chips in infringing modes. (Docket No.
 16 677 at 180-183; Docket No. 678 at 91; Pl. Exs. 1913; 1918; 1919).⁹ Specifically, CMU
 17 entered into evidence emails, firmware, as well as programming instructions for hardware
 18 showing that Marvell directed its customers, including Western Digital, Samsung, and
 19 Toshiba, to use the chips in infringing modes. (Pl. Exs. 730; 932; 1914; 1915; 1918; 1919).

20 84. Defendant Sehat Sutardja also had actual knowledge of CMU's patents and
 21 willfully and intentionally caused Marvell to disregard those patents. At trial, Sehat
 22 Sutardja testified that he was aware of the August 2003 letter from CMU and stated that

23
 24
 25
 26 ⁹ These references are to the docket in the CMU action, *Carnegie Mellon University v. Marvell*
 27 *Technology Group, Ltd.*, Case No. 09-cv-00290 (W.D. Pa.).
 28

1 Marvell did not respond to such letter because Marvell was “not interested in using the
 2 technology in our chip.” (Docket No. 707 at 91).

3 85. Defendant Sehat Sutardja is an expert with respect to patents, having been
 4 awarded over 260 patents. In addition to having served as Chairman of Marvell since
 5 2003, he has served at all relevant times as President, Chief Executive Officer, and as a
 6 Director of Marvell’s U.S. operating subsidiary, Marvell Semiconductor, Inc. He is a very
 7 “hands on” manager, as he testified at the CMU patent infringement trial, and as Marvell
 8 acknowledges on its website: “While remaining deeply involved in the daily challenges of
 9 running a global growth company, Dr. Sutardja participates heavily in Marvell’s
 10 engineering and marketing efforts across analog, video processor, and microprocessor
 11 design while offering input across all of the company’s other product lines.” During the
 12 relevant time period, Dr. Sutardja generally held weekly staff meetings with his senior
 13 vice-presidents, at which he was presented with weekly status reports.¹⁰

14 86. The defendants also had actual knowledge during the relevant time period
 15 that Marvell was not able to successfully develop and patent its own technology to address
 16 key issues with its products and that the key technology to address such issues was held by
 17 CMU. For example, Defendant Sehat Sutardja received an email on February 6, 2007
 18 from Gregory Burd, who stated: “We did not do a comparison with linear Viterbi since
 19 nowadays drives are dominated by media noise and MNP or NLV is a must.” As Dr.
 20 Sutardja testified at trial, MNP and NLV referred to technology covered by CMU’s
 21 patents. During the relevant period, Marvell employees recognized that its own internal
 22 technology was woefully inadequate and did not sufficiently address media noise
 23 problems. Marvell’s own inferior technology was referred to by Marvell itself as “coffee

24
 25
 26¹⁰ Dr. Sutardja testified that these meetings were attended, at a minimum, by Marvell vice
 27 presidents Dr. Armstrong, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Doan, and Dr. Wu.
 28

1 “warmers” because it used so much electricity and was ineffective. As a result, Marvell did
 2 not use its own defective and inadequate technology in its chips but instead used CMU’s
 3 technology, without licensing it.

4 87. Further, after receiving actual notice of CMU’s patents, Defendants Sehat
 5 and Pantas Sutardja also failed to cause Marvell’s employees to take any significant action
 6 to investigate whether Marvell and others were infringing CMU’s patents. At trial, the
 7 evidence demonstrated this and that, to the contrary, the Sutardja brothers encouraged
 8 Marvell employees to continue working on Marvell products that infringed CMU’s
 9 patents. As the Court noted in a September 23, 2013 order denying Marvell’s motion to
 10 set aside the verdict for insufficient evidence: “Despite knowing about the patents-in-suit,
 11 the evidence presented at trial reveals that Marvell made little effort to determine whether
 12 it was infringing these patents. Dr. Wu, Mr. Burd, and Mr. Doan all state that they decided
 13 not to read the patent claims, even though email correspondence indicates that both were
 14 aware that Dr. Kavcic had patented his algorithm. (Pl. Ex. 280; Pl. Ex. 283). If believed,
 15 this behavior is a clear sign they disregarded a high likelihood of infringement. Once
 16 presented with the patents, Mr. Doan did not conduct further investigations on his own, tell
 17 others to investigate or send the patents to Marvell’s legal team.⁷² (Docket No. 761 at Jt.
 18 Ex. C at 125-130). Instead, he directed his employees to continue working to capture the
 19 realized gain and reported that his employees would continue to work on the “Kavcic
 20 model.” (*Id.* at Ex. D at 190-191; Pl. Ex. 285). This occurred around the time that he was
 21 promoted from his position as principal engineer of the signal processing group to Vice
 22 President of read channel development. (Docket No. 761 at Jt. Ex. C at 16-17). While
 23 Marvell alleges that the MNP is a suboptimal version of Dr. Kavcic’s work, Dr. Wu’s
 24 2003 email to Doan stated that he and Burd were implementing an approach that “turns
 25 out to be the original structure that Kavcic proposed in his paper.” (Pl. Ex. 366; Docket
 26 No. 677 at 134-135).”

27

28

1 88. The evidence at the CMU trial further established willfulness because it was
 2 established that Marvell failed to follow its own internal policy concerning steps to be
 3 taken when risks concerning potential patent infringement are made known to the
 4 Company: “These failed opportunities to investigate engendered a great deal of risk that
 5 Marvell’s engineers infringed CMU’s patents. Moreover, the lack of action by Marvell’s
 6 employees does not conform to Marvell’s own purported IP policy, which according to the
 7 testimony of Dr. Armstrong, Marvell’s Vice President of Marketing, requires that any such
 8 information about patents be forwarded to the legal department for analysis. (Docket No.
 9 761 at Jt. Ex. C at 294-295). Despite this, Dr. Armstrong stated that he did not know
 10 whether the CMU Patents were ever submitted to the legal department according to this
 11 policy. (*Id.* at 295, 299). He further testified that he was not aware of any internal
 12 discussion about licensing the patents from CMU given Fujitsu’s letter request. (*Id.*)”¹¹

13 89. In finding that the evidence adduced at the CMU trial was sufficient to
 14 establish willful infringement, the Court further stated: “Marvell’s lack of inquiry about
 15 the possibility of infringement also meant that it took no effort to avoid infringement of the
 16 subject patents. This fact was specifically corroborated by Mr. Burd, who stated that he
 17 was not aware of any measures being taken to stop using the CMU Patents. (Docket No.
 18 678 at 101). Marvell is a sophisticated entity with nearly 3,000 patents. (Docket No. 707
 19 at 53). Yet, it took absolutely no steps to investigate these patents before producing 2.3
 20 billion chips, despite the fact that the technology was *named* after Dr. Kavcic, one of the
 21 inventors of the CMU Patents.⁷³ To this day, Marvell continues to use the Accused
 22 Technology. In fact, at trial Mr. Burd testified that Marvell had no plans to discontinue

23
 24
 25
 26 ¹¹ Quote is from Court’s September 23, 2013 Order denying Marvell’s motion to set aside the
 27 verdict, at p. 70.
 28

1 using the technology. (Docket No. 678 at 101). Only as of July 2013—seven months after
 2 the verdict—is it beginning to design around the technology. (Docket Nos. 889; 898).”¹²

3 90. “Succinctly put, Burd presented his superiors at Marvell with a product
 4 named “KavcicPP” and noted that Dr. Kavcic held a patent on such a detection scheme,
 5 yet nothing was apparently done to investigate infringement, reach out to Dr. Kavcic or
 6 CMU, or respond to CMU and Fujitsu’s inquiries on same. Accordingly, CMU has shown
 7 that Marvell’s behavior created an objectively high risk of infringement. *See Spectralytics,*
 8 *Inc. v. Cordis Corp.*, 649 F.3d 1336, 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (failure to investigate the patent
 9 situation is a consideration that tends to establish willful infringement).”¹³

10 91. Defendants’ willful infringement and wrongful conduct was also noted by
 11 the Court (Hon. Nora Fischer, presiding) in the CMU trial on several occasions. The
 12 Court noted that Marvell tap-danced around a “reliance on counsel” defense. It did not
 13 assert an actual reliance on counsel defense, apparently because it did not want to waive
 14 the privilege and be forced to produce communications to and from its lawyers. But, as
 15 the Court noted: “Marvell, however, has expressly stated throughout this litigation that it is
 16 not raising advice of counsel as a defense to the willfulness claims. (Docket No. 174-1 at
 17 77-78). To that end, the Court on December 20, 2012 ruled that Marvell could not at trial –
 18 “without putting the actual communications from counsel at issue – argue that its receipt of
 19 a patent implies or suggests that Marvell’s counsel returned a favorable opinion that
 20 Marvell’s NLD-type and MNP-type chips and simulators and the Kavcic-Viterbi simulator
 21 do not practice the patented methods of the asserted claims.” (Docket No. 753). **Despite**

22
 23 ¹² Quote is from Court’s September 23, 2013 Order denying Marvell’s motion to set aside the
 24 verdict, at pp. 70-71.

25 ¹³ Quote is from Court’s September 23, 2013 Order denying Marvell’s motion to set aside the
 26 verdict, at p. 71.

1 ***this, Marvell's counsel attempted to imply at closing that its engineers had vetted this***
 2 ***patent with counsel based on snippets of Dr. Wu's testimony. (Docket No. 759 at 79-***
 3 ***80).***¹⁴ (emphasis added). In response to the attempt by Marvell's counsel at closing
 4 argument to suggest that Marvell had vetted the patent with counsel, the Court observed:
 5 "The Court has doubts about the credibility of certain testimony⁷⁹ regarding this
 6 consultation and the reasonableness of this defense, given its years of involvement with
 7 this matter.⁸⁰" In footnote 79 which accompanied the immediately preceding quote, the
 8 Court stated: "As the Court recounted in its opinion on Marvell's Motion for a Mistrial,
 9 (Docket No. 900), Dr. Wu during his testimony clenched his jaw, drank an entire pitcher
 10 of water, generally appeared uncomfortable, and continuously looked at Dr. Sutardja in the
 11 back of the courtroom throughout his appearance as a witness. In this Court's estimation,
 12 the jury could have easily found Dr. Wu was not credible given his demeanor on the stand.
 13 On this and all other areas of inquiry, the jury was charged to weigh witness testimony and
 14 give it the appropriate weight it deserved or discredit the testimony completely. *See, e.g.,*
 15 *Barber v. CSX Distribution Servs.*, 68 F.3d 694, 700 (3d Cir. 1995)."

16 92. In addition to the actual knowledge of Marvell's patent infringement by
 17 defendants Sehat and Pantas Sutardja, the other director defendants either knew or
 18 recklessly disregarded Marvell's infringement of CMU's patents. Indeed, in 2009 CMU
 19 filed its patent infringement lawsuit against Marvell. Thus, at least beginning in 2009,
 20 director defendants Gromer, Kassakian, Krueger and Thakur, as well as Weili Dai, had
 21 actual knowledge that CMU alleged infringement by Marvell. These defendants are all
 22 highly sophisticated in technology companies and patents. For example, Dr. Thakur has
 23 been issued close to 300 patents. Thakur is currently executive vice president and general
 24

25
 26 ¹⁴ Quote is from Court's September 23, 2013 Order denying Marvell's motion to set aside the
 27 verdict, at p. 74.
 28

1 manager of the Silicon Systems Group at Applied Materials, Inc., which comprises the
 2 entire portfolio of semiconductor manufacturing systems at Applied Materials. In this role,
 3 Dr. Thakur is responsible for strengthening Applied Materials' market in its core wafer
 4 fabrication equipment markets. Dr. Thakur holds a BS with honors in Electronics and
 5 Telecommunications Engineering from the National Institute of Technology, Kurukshetra,
 6 India, an MS in Electrical Engineering from the University of Saskatchewan, Canada and
 7 a Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering from the University of Oklahoma.

8 93. Likewise, Defendant Krueger has more than 40 years of experience in the
 9 international semiconductor industry and acquired a wealth of experience in complex
 10 systems architecture, semiconductor design and development, operations, and international
 11 marketing, as well as general management of a large company. Krueger holds a MS in
 12 Electrical Engineering from the Institute of Technology in Switzerland and has studied
 13 Advanced Computer Science at the University of Minnesota.

14 94. Defendant Kassakian holds S.B., S.M., E.E. and Sc.D. degrees from MIT
 15 and has been a member of the faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science at
 16 the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (“MIT”) since 1973 and served as Director of
 17 the MIT Laboratory for Electromagnetic and Electronic Systems from 1991 to 2009. Dr.
 18 Kassakian is the founding President of the IEEE Power Electronics Society and is a
 19 member of the National Academy of Engineering. Marvell’s website touts Dr.
 20 Kassakian’s “expertise in the semiconductor field and academic experience related to the
 21 technology sector” as positive factors that qualify him to sit on Marvell’s board.

22 95. Likewise, Defendant Gromer is sophisticated in the fields of engineering and
 23 patents. He received his undergraduate degree and Ph.D. in Physics from the University of
 24 Stuttgart, Germany. Gromer is the retired President of Tyco Electronics Ltd., an
 25 electronics company, a position which he held from April 1999 until December 31, 2007.
 26 Dr. Gromer formerly held senior management positions from 1983 to 1998 at AMP
 27 Incorporated (acquired by Tyco International in April 1999) including Senior Vice
 28

1 President of Worldwide Sales and Services, President of the Global Automotive Division,
 2 Vice President of Central and Eastern Europe and General Manager of AMP.

3 96. Defendant Dai had actual knowledge of these facts because of her position
 4 with Marvell and because of daily communications she has with her husband, Defendant
 5 Sehat Sutardja.

6 97. Thus, because of their educational background, work experience,
 7 relationship with Sehat and Pantas Sutardja, and experience in applying for patents and/or
 8 reviewing the value and importance of patents to the companies they have worked for,
 9 Defendants Gromer, Kassakian, Krueger, Dai and Thakur were particularly suited to
 10 evaluate the materiality of the relevant patents and technology to Marvell's business,
 11 revenues, and profits. When CMU sued Marvell for patent infringement in 2009,
 12 Defendants Gromer, Kassakian, Krueger, Dai and Thakur were required to conduct an
 13 investigation into the allegations and determine if the allegations had merit. Upon
 14 information and belief, they conducted such an investigation and determined that Marvell
 15 had actually infringed the patents or that there was a significant likelihood that Marvell
 16 had infringed CMU's patents. Nonetheless, they failed to take appropriate action.

17 98. Among other things, upon being presented with evidence of Marvell's
 18 infringement, Defendants Gromer, Kassakian, Krueger, Dai and Thakur could have and
 19 should have caused Marvell to settle the case at a reasonable cost. The evidence at trial
 20 demonstrates that CMU acted reasonably at all times and would have accepted a
 21 reasonable settlement offer. Marvell's own expert at trial suggested that a reasonable
 22 license for CMU's patents would be a one-time royalty of \$250,000. Tellingly, Marvell
 23 rejected CMU's reasonable offers to allow Marvell to license its patents back in 2003.

24 99. While it is unknown what Marvell could have negotiated as a reasonable
 25 license fee back in 2003, any such license would have cost Marvell far less than the \$1
 26 billion verdict. Moreover, again, once CMU filed its lawsuit in 2009, Marvell could have
 27 negotiated a reasonable settlement far below \$1 billion. It refused to do so and instead

1 actually continued to willfully infringe CMU's patents, even after the lawsuit was filed.
 2 As Judge Fischer noted, ***the director defendants, including Defendants Gromer,***
 3 ***Kassakian, Krueger, Dai and Thakur, caused Marvell to willfully infringe CMU's***
 4 ***patents even after the jury verdict was returned in December 2012. Marvell did not stop***
 5 ***selling the infringing chips until July 2013, six months after the jury verdict was***
 6 ***entered.***

7 100. Thus, Defendants Gromer, Kassakian, Krueger, Dai and Thakur breached
 8 their duty of candor and acted in bad faith and in a dishonest manner by refusing to cause
 9 Marvell to settle the CMU lawsuit for a reasonable sum and by increasing Marvell's
 10 damages by causing Marvell to continue to sell the infringing chips even after the jury
 11 verdict was entered.

12 101. Moreover, by refusing to settle the CMU suit in bad faith, Defendants
 13 Gromer, Kassakian, Krueger, Dai and Thakur have now damaged Marvell further, in an
 14 amount in excess of \$1.54 billion. Had Defendants Gromer, Kassakian, Krueger, Dai and
 15 Thakur acted reasonably and in good faith and settled the CMU lawsuit for a reasonable
 16 amount, Marvell would have avoided any exposure for willful infringement.

17 102. Analysts noted the huge damage which has been caused to Marvell due to
 18 the CMU judgment, and which will continue to be caused. A January 9, 2013 article in
 19 GMI Ratings entitled "Can Only SpiderMan Save Marvell Technology Group?" noted:

20 "While it is important to note that the \$1.17 billion verdict is subject to appeal, there
 21 is also a possibility that the damages could triple to about \$3.5 billion—an amount
 22 that is dangerously close to the company's current market cap value of \$4.2
 23 billion—since jurors found Marvell's patent infringement was willful. In addition
 24 to the \$1.17 billion jury award, Marvell is required to make 50-cent royalty
 25 payments on all infringing HD controller chips sold in the future. According to a
 26 report on Seeking Alpha, ***the CMU patents "currently encompass all of Marvell's***
 27 ***HD chips [and] the per-chip royalty will result in roughly a 20% hit to operating***

margins on their HD controller business.” The report goes on to say that “***since the HD controller business makes up approximately 50% of Marvell’s sales, the ongoing impact to earnings will be astounding, and could result in a 25% reduction in net earnings for Marvell as a whole going forward.***”

5 103. With respect to ongoing royalties, on May 1, 2014, Marvell and CMU filed a
6 Joint Report with Judge Fischer indicating that Marvell's sales of infringing chips during
7 the period 11/03/13 – 02/01/14 was in excess of \$390 million.¹⁵ Thus, because the
8 Judgment calls for Marvell to pay a royalty of \$0.50 per infringed chip sold, Marvell is
9 exposed to ongoing royalty damages of at least \$195 million in addition to the amount of
10 the Judgment itself.

V. MATERIALLY FALSE AND MISLEADING STATEMENTS ISSUED DURING THE RELEVANT PERIOD

13 104. In addition to willfully infringing CMU's patents during the Relevant
14 Period, the Individual Defendants caused the Company to issue false and misleading
15 statements which failed to disclose the fact that Marvell was willfully infringing CMU's
16 patents and instead falsely stated or implied that Marvell had patents covering all its key
17 technology and/or had paid appropriate licenses to persons who held patents for the
18 relevant technology.

19 105. False Statements in Marvell's 2007 Annual Report: Marvell's 2007 Annual
20 Report was filed with the SEC on Form 10-K and mailed to Marvell's shareholders on or
21 about July 2, 2007. It was drafted, reviewed, approved, and signed by the Individual
22 Defendants Sehat Sutardja, Pantas Sutardja, Arturo Krueger, and non-defendant Michael
23 Tate, among others. In the 2007 Annual Report, Individual Defendants Sehat Sutardja,

¹⁵ Marvell and CMU disagreed slightly on the exact sales figures. Marvell listed total sales during this time period of \$390,726,473, while CMU listed sales of \$392,029,138.

1 Pantas Sutardja, and Arturo Krueger caused Marvell to make the following false and
 2 misleading statements about Marvell's intellectual property and patents:

3 "Intellectual Property"

4 Our future revenue growth and overall success depend in large part on our ability to
 5 protect our intellectual property. We rely on a combination of patents, copyrights,
 6 trademarks, trade secret laws, contractual provisions and licenses to protect our
 7 intellectual property. We also enter into confidentiality agreements with our
 8 employees, consultants, suppliers and customers and seek to control access to, and
 9 distribution of, our documentation and other proprietary information. Despite these
 10 precautions, it may be possible for a third-party to copy or otherwise obtain and use
 11 our products and technology without authorization, develop similar technology
 12 independently or design around our patents. ***In addition, we often incorporate the
 13 intellectual property of other companies into our designs, and we have certain
 14 obligations with respect to the non-use and non-disclosure of their intellectual
 15 property.*** It is possible, however, that the steps taken by us to prevent
 16 misappropriation or infringement of our intellectual property or our customers'
 17 intellectual property may not be successful."

18 106. Why the statement was false: The italicized statement above in Marvell's
 19 2007 Annual Report was false and misleading because it failed to disclose to Marvell's
 20 shareholders that Marvell ***had actually incorporated CMU's intellectual property into its
 21 chip designs but failed to pay a licensing fee to CMU for use of CMU's patents.*** The
 22 Individual Defendants, as alleged in great detail herein, knew this statement, as well as the
 23 further statements identified below, were false because they had received notice of CMU's
 24 patents in 2002 and 2003, along with an invitation to license the patents, but declined to
 25 license the patents and instead instructed Marvell employees to incorporate CMU's
 26 intellectual property into Marvell's chip designs illegally, and without paying the
 27 necessary license. The amounts involved were highly material to Marvell's results and
 28 operations, as reflected in the eventual jury verdict against Marvell for willful patent
 infringement.

29 107. False Statement: Marvell's 2007 Annual Report also stated:

30 ***As of January 27, 2007, we have been issued or have acquired 406 United States
 31 patents and 72 non-United States patents on various aspects of our technology,***

1 *with expiration dates ranging from 2008 to 2025. We have filed a number of*
 2 *additional patent applications in the United States and other countries.*

3 We have expended and will continue to expend considerable resources in
 4 establishing a patent position designed to protect our intellectual property. While
 5 *our ability to compete is enhanced by our ability to protect our intellectual*
 6 *property*, we believe that in view of the rapid pace of technological change, *the*
 7 *combination of the technical experience and innovative skills of our employees*
may be as important to our business as the legal protection of our patents and
other proprietary information.

8 *From time to time, we may desire or be required to renew or to obtain licenses*
 9 *from third parties in order to further develop and effectively market commercially*
 10 *viable products. We cannot be sure that any necessary licenses will be available*
or will be available on commercially reasonable terms.

11 108. Why the statements were false: The italicized statement above in Marvell's
 12 2007 Annual Report was false and misleading because it suggested that Marvell had
 13 intellectual property or patents covering all the technology it incorporated into its chip
 14 designs and chips. The statements told shareholders and the stock market that Marvell's
 15 business and success were the product of *its patents*, and that its ability to protect *its*
 16 *intellectual property* enhanced Marvell's "ability to compete" in the marketplace and vis-
 17 à-vis its competitors. The statements also falsely told investors that "the technical
 18 experience and innovative skills of our employees may be as important to our business as
 19 the legal protection of our patents and other proprietary information." Both of these
 20 statements were false and misleading half-truths since: (1) Marvell did not disclose that a
 21 huge and material portion of its chip designs and chips relied on CMU's patents, which
 22 Marvell was willfully infringing, and not on any patents or IP owned by Marvell; and (2)
 23 Marvell's employees, regardless of whether they did or did not have experience and
 24 innovate skills in general, were not using any of their innovative skills or experience in
 25 developing the Company's NLD, MNP, and EMNP chips (as well as the simulators

1 associated with developing such chips and the related technology)¹⁶ but instead were
 2 intentionally and illegally copying CMU's intellectual property and patents without
 3 negotiating or paying a licensing fee to CMU. Moreover, the statement "From time to
 4 time, we may desire or be required to renew or to obtain licenses from third parties in
 5 order to further develop and effectively market commercially viable products" was false
 6 and misleading because the Individual Defendants knew, but omitted to disclose, that
 7 Marvell was intentionally and illegally copying CMU's intellectual property and patents
 8 without negotiating or paying a licensing fee to CMU.

9 109. False Statement: Marvell's 2007 Annual Report also falsely stated that its
 10 products were based on its own proprietary technology, and failed to disclose that the
 11 products were actually based on CMU's patented and proprietary technology and that
 12 Marvell was willfully infringing CMU's patents. The 2007 Annual Report specifically
 13 made these statements with respect to Marvell's Read Channel circuits and System on a
 14 Chip ("SOC") product, an integrated drive electronics platform. Both Marvell's Read
 15 Channel circuits and its SOC products incorporated Marvell's MNP, EMNP-type, and
 16 NLD type chips, all of which were proven at the CMU patent trial to infringe CMU's
 17 patents. With respect to Marvell's Read Channel and SOC products, the 2007 Annual
 18 Report stated:

19
 20 **Our Markets and Products**

21 We target computers, communications-related equipment and consumer
 22 devices that require integrated circuit devices for high-speed data storage,
 23 transmission, and management. We also target a broad range of electronic products
 24 that can utilize our power management solutions. Additionally, we are developing
 25 new products that are targeted for new markets that we currently do not serve. Our
 26 current product offerings are primarily targeted at three main markets: business
 27 enterprise, consumer and emerging markets.

28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000
 1001
 1002
 1003
 1004
 1005
 1006
 1007
 1008
 1009
 1010
 1011
 1012
 1013
 1014
 1015
 1016
 1017
 1018
 1019
 1020
 1021
 1022
 1023
 1024
 1025
 1026
 1027
 1028
 1029
 1030
 1031
 1032
 1033
 1034
 1035
 1036
 1037
 1038
 1039
 1040
 1041
 1042
 1043
 1044
 1045
 1046
 1047
 1048
 1049
 1050
 1051
 1052
 1053
 1054
 1055
 1056
 1057
 1058
 1059
 1060
 1061
 1062
 1063
 1064
 1065
 1066
 1067
 1068
 1069
 1070
 1071
 1072
 1073
 1074
 1075
 1076
 1077
 1078
 1079
 1080
 1081
 1082
 1083
 1084
 1085
 1086
 1087
 1088
 1089
 1090
 1091
 1092
 1093
 1094
 1095
 1096
 1097
 1098
 1099
 1100
 1101
 1102
 1103
 1104
 1105
 1106
 1107
 1108
 1109
 1110
 1111
 1112
 1113
 1114
 1115
 1116
 1117
 1118
 1119
 1120
 1121
 1122
 1123
 1124
 1125
 1126
 1127
 1128
 1129
 1130
 1131
 1132
 1133
 1134
 1135
 1136
 1137
 1138
 1139
 1140
 1141
 1142
 1143
 1144
 1145
 1146
 1147
 1148
 1149
 1150
 1151
 1152
 1153
 1154
 1155
 1156
 1157
 1158
 1159
 1160
 1161
 1162
 1163
 1164
 1165
 1166
 1167
 1168
 1169
 1170
 1171
 1172
 1173
 1174
 1175
 1176
 1177
 1178
 1179
 1180
 1181
 1182
 1183
 1184
 1185
 1186
 1187
 1188
 1189
 1190
 1191
 1192
 1193
 1194
 1195
 1196
 1197
 1198
 1199
 1200
 1201
 1202
 1203
 1204
 1205
 1206
 1207
 1208
 1209
 1210
 1211
 1212
 1213
 1214
 1215
 1216
 1217
 1218
 1219
 1220
 1221
 1222
 1223
 1224
 1225
 1226
 1227
 1228
 1229
 1230
 1231
 1232
 1233
 1234
 1235
 1236
 1237
 1238
 1239
 1240
 1241
 1242
 1243
 1244
 1245
 1246
 1247
 1248
 1249
 1250
 1251
 1252
 1253
 1254
 1255
 1256
 1257
 1258
 1259
 1260
 1261
 1262
 1263
 1264
 1265
 1266
 1267
 1268
 1269
 1270
 1271
 1272
 1273
 1274
 1275
 1276
 1277
 1278
 1279
 1280
 1281
 1282
 1283
 1284
 1285
 1286
 1287
 1288
 1289
 1290
 1291
 1292
 1293
 1294
 1295
 1296
 1297
 1298
 1299
 1300
 1301
 1302
 1303
 1304
 1305
 1306
 1307
 1308
 1309
 1310
 1311
 1312
 1313
 1314
 1315
 1316
 1317
 1318
 1319
 1320
 1321
 1322
 1323
 1324
 1325
 1326
 1327
 1328
 1329
 1330
 1331
 1332
 1333
 1334
 1335
 1336
 1337
 1338
 1339
 1340
 1341
 1342
 1343
 1344
 1345
 1346
 1347
 1348
 1349
 1350
 1351
 1352
 1353
 1354
 1355
 1356
 1357
 1358
 1359
 1360
 1361
 1362
 1363
 1364
 1365
 1366
 1367
 1368
 1369
 1370
 1371
 1372
 1373
 1374
 1375
 1376
 1377
 1378
 1379
 1380
 1381
 1382
 1383
 1384
 1385
 1386
 1387
 1388
 1389
 1390
 1391
 1392
 1393
 1394
 1395
 1396
 1397
 1398
 1399
 1400
 1401
 1402
 1403
 1404
 1405
 1406
 1407
 1408
 1409
 1410
 1411
 1412
 1413
 1414
 1415
 1416
 1417
 1418
 1419
 1420
 1421
 1422
 1423
 1424
 1425
 1426
 1427
 1428
 1429
 1430
 1431
 1432
 1433
 1434
 1435
 1436
 1437
 1438
 1439
 1440
 1441
 1442
 1443
 1444
 1445
 1446
 1447
 1448
 1449
 1450
 1451
 1452
 1453
 1454
 1455
 1456
 1457
 1458
 1459
 1460
 1461
 1462
 1463
 1464
 1465
 1466
 1467
 1468
 1469
 1470
 1471
 1472
 1473
 1474
 1475
 1476
 1477
 1478
 1479
 1480
 1481
 1482
 1483
 1484
 1485
 1486
 1487
 1

1 *We offer our customers in these markets a wide range of integrated circuit
 2 solutions using proprietary Communications Mixed-Signal Processing, or
 3 CMSP, and digital signal processing technologies. We are applying our analog,
 4 mixed-signal, digital signal processing, embedded microprocessor and **complex**
 5 **digital design technologies in a variety of applications.** Our broad product
 6 portfolio consists of storage, switching, transceivers, cellular and handheld,
 7 wireless, PC connectivity, gateways, communications controllers and power
 8 management products.*

9
Storage Products

10 We offer a broad range of storage products for hard disk drive and tape drive
 11 electronics and storage interconnect technology. Also, we recently developed our
 12 first optical storage products for DVD recorders that will be used in computer
 13 applications.

14 **Read Channel.** A read channel is an integrated circuit that provides the interface
 15 between the analog signals stored on magnetic disk drives and the digital signals
 16 that computers can understand and manipulate. *The performance of the read
 17 channel normally drives the performance of the overall storage system. We utilize
 18 advanced mixed-signal and digital signal processing technologies in our array of
 19 partial response maximum likelihood, or PRML read channel products. Our
 20 technology incorporates an efficient data-encoding scheme in addition to
 21 advanced digital filtering and data-detection techniques.* Our read channel
 22 products are designed to allow customers to achieve high areal density in addition
 23 to fast data transfer rates for their hard disk drives. *Our read channels utilize
 24 custom digital and analog blocks running at a very high frequency while
 25 achieving low power consumption.*

26 Our read channel integrated circuits target specific feature and performance
 27 requirements of the enterprise, desktop and mobile computing markets. Our
 28 strategy is to consolidate the signal processing algorithms required by each of our
 29 different market segments into a single integrated circuit design. This consolidation
 30 can result in cost savings and reduced product line complexity.

31 **System-On-Chip.** *Our integrated drive electronics platform is a flexible
 32 system-on-a-chip, or SOC solution that provides increased performance, reduced
 33 power consumption and cost savings essential for next-generation hard disk
 34 drives. Utilizing our leading-edge read channel physical layer devices* as the core
 35 for integration, we have the flexibility to either add any number of functional
 36 blocks available in our portfolio or to integrate customer provided intellectual
 37 property. With our high data transfer rates, our integrated SOC platform provides
 38 solutions that have the ability to span multiple product generations, allowing for
 39 risk-reduction, cost savings and accelerated time-to-market. Our integrated SOC
 40 platform is designed to provide a solution for enterprise, desktop and mobile
 41 systems. Our current SOC products incorporate the read channel, hard disk

1 controller, embedded memory and one or more microprocessors into a single
2 integrated circuit.

3 110. Why Statements Were False – The statements referenced above about
4 Marvell’s Read Channel and SOC products were false and misleading because they stated
5 and/or implied that such products were based on Marvell’s own proprietary technology
6 and patents, and did not disclose that Marvell’s Read Channel circuits and its SOC
7 products incorporated Marvell’s MNP, EMNP-type, and NLD type chips, all of which
8 infringed CMU’s patents. Marvell used CMU’s technology and patents in its Read
9 Channel and SOC products precisely because CMU’s technology and patents were far
10 superior to any technology Marvell had developed. Indeed, the evidence at the CMU trial
11 demonstrated that Marvell’s technology for the Read Channel products was referred to by
12 Marvell employees as “coffee warmers” because it used so much power. CMU’s
13 technology, in stark contrasts, allowed higher performance and less power consumption.
14 Thus, the statement quoted above from the 2007 Annual Report that “Our read channels
15 utilize custom digital and analog blocks running at a very high frequency while achieving
16 low power consumption” was false and misleading because Defendants failed to disclose
17 that it was CMU’s technology, not Marvell’s, that was the cause of these benefits, and that
18 Marvell was using CMU’s patented technology without negotiating and paying a
19 necessary license or royalty.

20 111. Statements in Marvell’s 2008 Annual Report: Marvell’s 2008 Annual
21 Report was filed with the SEC on Form 10-K and mailed to Marvell’s shareholders on or
22 about March 28, 2008. It was drafted, reviewed, approved, and signed by the Individual
23 Defendants Sehat Sutardja, Pantas Sutardja, Arturo Krueger, and Juergen Gromer, among
24 others. In the 2008 Annual Report, Individual Defendants Sehat Sutardja, Pantas Sutardja,
25

1 Arturo Krueger, and Juergen Gromer caused Marvell to make the same false and
2 misleading statements as were made in the 2007 Annual Report. A true and correct copy
3 of such false statements from the 2008 Annual Report is attached hereto as **Ex. 1**, and
4 incorporated herein by reference. Those statements were false and misleading for the
5 same reasons stated *supra* in ¶¶106, 108, and 110.

6 112. False Statements in 2009 Annual Report: Marvell's 2009 Annual Report
7 was filed with the SEC on Form 10-K and mailed to Marvell's shareholders on or about
8 March 31, 2009. It was drafted, reviewed, approved, and signed by the Individual
9 Defendants Sehat Sutardja, Pantas Sutardja, John G. Kassakian, Arturo Krueger, and
10 Juergen Gromer, and non-defendant Clyde R. Hosein, among others. In the 2009 Annual
11 Report, Individual Defendants Sehat Sutardja, Pantas Sutardja, John G. Kassakian, Arturo
12 Krueger, and Juergen Gromer caused Marvell to make the same false and misleading
13 statements as those made in the 2007 and 2008 Annual Reports. A true and correct copy
14 of such false statements from the 2009 Annual Report is attached hereto as **Ex. 2**, and
15 incorporated herein by reference. Those statements were false and misleading for the
16 same reasons stated *supra* in ¶¶106, 108, and 110.

19 113. False Statements in Marvell's 2010 Annual Report: Marvell's 2010 Annual
20 Report was filed with the SEC on Form 10-K and mailed to Marvell's shareholders on or
21 about March 30, 2010. It was drafted, reviewed, approved, and signed by the Individual
22 Defendants Sehat Sutardja, Pantas Sutardja, John G. Kassakian, Arturo Krueger, and
23 Juergen Gromer, and non-defendant Clyde R. Hosein, among others. In the 2010 Annual
24 Report, Individual Defendants Sehat Sutardja, Pantas Sutardja, John G. Kassakian, Arturo
25 Krueger, and Juergen Gromer caused Marvell to make substantially similar false and
26 misleading statements as those made in the 2007-2009 Annual Reports. A true and correct
27
28

1 copy of such false statements from the 2010 Annual Report is attached hereto as **Ex. 3**,
 2 and incorporated herein by reference. Those statements were false and misleading for the
 3 same reasons stated *supra* in ¶¶106, 108, and 110.

4 114. The statements in the 2010 Annual Report concerning Marvell's Read
 5 Channel products were slightly different than in previous years, and emphasized to even a
 6 greater degree that it was Marvell's technology and that such technology gave it a
 7 competitive edge. The 2010 Annual Report stated:

8 Overview

9 We are a fabless semiconductor provider of high-performance application-specific
 10 standard products. ***Our core strength of expertise is the development of complex***
 11 ***System-on-a-Chip ("SoC") devices leveraging our extensive technology portfolio***
 12 ***of intellectual property*** in the areas of analog, mixed-signal, digital signal
 13 processing and embedded ARM-based microprocessor integrated circuits.

14 115. The 2010 Annual Report also stated:

15 Storage Products

16 We offer a broad range of storage products targeted for hard disk drives, tape drive
 17 electronics, optical disk drives, solid-state flash drives and storage subsystems
 18 technology. We offer both discrete components targeted at specific storage-class
 19 requirements, as well as complex SoC solutions, which integrate multiple
 20 functional blocks onto a single device.

21 ***Storage System-on-a-Chip: Our integrated drive electronics platform is a***
 22 ***flexible SoC solution that provides increased performance, reduced power***
 23 ***consumption and cost savings essential for next-generation hard disk drives.*** We
 24 provide Storage SoC solutions for enterprise, desktop and mobile storage systems.

25 Utilizing ***our leading-edge read channel devices*** as the core for integration, we
 26 have the flexibility to either add any number of functional blocks available in our
 27 portfolio or to integrate customer provided intellectual property. With our high data
 28 transfer rates, ***our advanced SoC platform*** provides solutions that have the ability
 29 to span multiple product generations, allowing for product life cycle risk-reduction,
 30 lower cost of ownership and accelerated time-to-market.

31 ***Our current SoC products incorporate the read channel, hard disk controller***
 32 ***("HDC"), embedded memory and one or more Marvell designed ARM-***
 33 ***microprocessors into a single integrated circuit.***

1 ***Read Channel:*** A read channel is a mixed-signal integrated circuit that provides the
 2 interface between the analog signals stored on magnetic disk drives and the digital
 3 signals that computers can understand and manipulate. ***The performance of the***
 4 ***read channel is a key factor to the overall performance of the hard disk drive***
 5 ***storage system.*** Read channel performance is measured as a function of the signal-
 6 to-noise ratio (“SNR”). The higher the SNR value of a read channel circuit, the
 7 better the circuit is able to separate valid data from system induced noise. ***Our***
 8 ***ability to consistently develop multiple generations of read channel circuits with***
 9 ***industry leading SNR performance has enabled our customers to improve***
 10 ***finished drive yields and to yield higher density drives given a fixed aerial density***
 11 ***platter.***

12 ***In the development of our read channel products we utilize advanced mixed-***
 13 ***signal and digital signal processing technologies.*** Our read channel devices utilize
 14 a variety of advanced signaling algorithms including advanced partial response
 15 maximum likelihood (Advanced PMRL) or the low density parity check (“LDPC”)
 16 algorithm. We anticipate the majority of our future storage SoC solutions for high-
 17 density drives will be based on LDPC read channel technology. Our technology
 18 incorporates an efficient data-encoding scheme in addition to advanced digital
 19 filtering and data-detection techniques. Our read channel products are designed to
 20 allow customers to achieve high areal density in addition to fast data transfer rates
 21 for their hard disk drives. Our read channels utilize custom digital and analog
 22 blocks running at a very high frequency while achieving low power consumption.

23 116. **Why Statements Were False** – These statements in the 2010 Annual Report
 24 were false and misleading for the same reasons noted in ¶¶106, 108, and 110.

25 117. **False Statements in the 2011 Annual Report:** Marvell’s 2011 Annual Report
 26 was filed with the SEC on Form 10-K and mailed to Marvell’s shareholders on or about
 27 March 25, 2011. It was drafted, reviewed, approved, and signed by the Individual
 28 Defendants Sehat Sutardja, Pantas Sutardja, John G. Kassakian, Arturo Krueger, Juergen
 Gromer, and non-defendant Clyde R. Hosein, among others. In the 2011 Annual Report,
 Individual Defendants Sehat Sutardja, Pantas Sutardja, John G. Kassakian, Arturo
 Krueger, Juergen Gromer caused Marvell to make substantially similar false and
 misleading statements as those made in the 2007-2010 Annual Reports. A true and
 correct copy of such false statements from the 2011 Annual Report is attached hereto as

1 **Ex. 4**, and incorporated herein by reference. Those statements were false and misleading
 2 for the same reasons stated *supra* in ¶¶106, 108, and 110.

3 118. The statements in the 2011 Annual Report concerning Marvell's Read
 4 Channel products were slightly different than in previous years, and emphasized to even a
 5 greater degree that it was Marvell's technology and that such technology gave it a
 6 competitive edge. The 2011 Annual Report stated:

7 **Read Channel:** A read channel is a mixed-signal integrated circuit that provides
 8 the interface between the analog signals stored on magnetic disk drives and the
 9 digital signals that computers can understand and manipulate. The performance of
 10 the read channel is a key factor to the overall performance of the hard disk drive
 11 storage system. Read channel performance is measured as a function of the signal-
 12 to-noise ratio ("SNR"). ***The higher the SNR value of a read channel circuit, the
 13 better the circuit is able to separate valid data from system induced noise. Our
 14 ability to consistently develop multiple generations of read channel circuits with
 15 industry leading SNR performance has enabled our customers to improve
 16 finished drive yields and to yield higher density drives given a fixed areal density
 17 platter.***

18 ***In the development of our read channel products we utilize advanced mixed-
 19 signal and digital signal processing technologies. Our read channel devices
 20 utilize a variety of advanced signaling algorithms including advanced partial
 21 response maximum likelihood or the low density parity check ("LDPC")
 22 algorithm. We anticipate the majority of our future storage SoC solutions for
 23 high-density drives will be based on LDPC read channel technology. Our
 24 technology incorporates an efficient data-encoding scheme in addition to
 25 advanced digital filtering and data-detection techniques. Our read channel
 26 products are designed to allow customers to achieve high areal density in addition
 27 to fast data transfer rates for their hard disk drives. Our read channels utilize
 28 custom digital and analog blocks running at a very high frequency while
 achieving low power consumption.***

29 119. **Why the Statements Were False:** The italicized statements above in
 30 Marvell's 2011 Annual Report were false and misleading because they suggested Marvell
 31 had developed and could consistently develop multiple generations of superior Read
 32 Channel products based on its own proprietary technology. This was false because
 33 Marvell's Read Channel products did not rely upon Marvell's technology for their
 34

1 advances but instead relied upon infringed CMU patents. The statements were also false
 2 because they failed to disclose to Marvell's shareholders that the relevant read channel
 3 products were actually developed based on technologies belonging to CMU which were
 4 protected by patent but were literally and willfully infringed by Marvell.

5 120. False Statements in Marvell's 2012 Annual Report: Marvell's 2012 Annual
 6 Report was filed with the SEC on Form 10-K and mailed to Marvell's shareholders on or
 7 about March 27, 2012. It was drafted, reviewed, approved, and signed by the Individual
 8 Defendants Sehat Sutardja, Pantas Sutardja, John G. Kassakian, Arturo Krueger, and
 9 Juergen Gromer, and non-defendant Clyde R. Hosein, among others. In the 2012 Annual
 10 Report, Individual Defendants Sehat Sutardja, Pantas Sutardja, John G. Kassakian, Arturo
 11 Krueger, and Juergen Gromer caused Marvell to make substantially similar false and
 12 misleading statements as those made in the prior annual reports. The exact false
 13 statements made are reflected in the highlighted portions of the 2012 Annual Report which
 14 are attached hereto as **Ex. 5**. Those statements were false and misleading for the same
 15 reasons stated *supra* in ¶¶106, 108, and 110.

16 121. False Statements in the 2013 Annual Report: Marvell's 2013 Annual Report
 17 was filed with the SEC on Form 10-K and mailed to Marvell's shareholders on or about
 18 March 29, 2013. It was drafted, reviewed, approved, and signed by the Individual
 19 Defendants Sehat Sutardja, Pantas Sutardja, John G. Kassakian, Arturo Krueger, Juergen
 20 Gromer, Randhir Thakur and non-defendant Brad D. Feller. In the 2013 Annual Report,
 21 Individual Defendants Sehat Sutardja, Pantas Sutardja, John G. Kassakian, Arturo
 22 Krueger, Juergen Gromer, and Randhir Thakur caused Marvell to make substantially
 23 similar false and misleading statements as those made in the prior annual reports noted
 24 above. The exact false statements made are reflected in the highlighted portions of the
 25 2013 Annual Report which are attached hereto as **Ex. 6**. Those statements were false and
 26 misleading for the same reasons stated *supra* in ¶¶106, 108, and 110.

27
 28

1 122. False Statements in the 2014 Annual Report: Marvell's 2014 Annual Report
2 was filed with the SEC on Form 10-K and mailed to Marvell's shareholders on or about
3 March 27, 2014. It was drafted, reviewed, approved, and signed by the Individual
4 Defendants Sehat Sutardja, John G. Kassakian, Arturo Krueger, Juergen Gromer, Randhir
5 Thakur and non-defendant Michael Rashkin. In the 2013 Annual Report, Individual
6 Defendants Sehat Sutardja, John G. Kassakian, Arturo Krueger, Juergen Gromer, and
7 Randhir Thakur caused Marvell to make substantially similar false and misleading
8 statements as those identified in the prior annual reports identified above. The exact false
9 statements made are reflected in the highlighted portions of the 2014 Annual Report which
10 are attached hereto as **Ex. 7.** Those statements were false and misleading for the same
11 reasons stated *supra* in ¶¶106, 108, and 110.

THE UNJUST COMPENSATION PAID TO DEFENDANTS

13 123. During the time they were causing Marvell to willfully infringe CMU's
14 patents and exposing Marvell to billions of dollars in damages, the Defendants were paid
15 excessive and unjust compensation.

16 124. During the relevant time period, most of the defendants' compensation from
17 Marvell was incentive-based compensation. As such, it was only earned if Marvell met or
18 exceeded certain performance goals. Those goals, and the formulas governing whether the
19 defendants' incentive-based compensation was earned for each relevant year, are set forth
20 in the Company's proxy statements on Form 14A filed with the SEC.

21 125. For example, for the performance-based awards (options or RSUs) given by
22 Marvell during the relevant time period to Sehat Sutardja, whether Sutardja received the awards
23 and, if so, the amount, was based on (a) earnings per share during 2008 (Marvell had to realize
24 EPS of at least \$1.06); (b) Relative Operating Margin in 2009 (operating margin achieved by
25 Marvell for the year had to be at or above the 60th percentile of a Performance Peer Group); (c)
26 Revenue and Operating Margin for 2011 (revenue growth had to be 10-25% higher than 2010;
27 non-GAAP operating margin had to be between 23.5% and 26%). In the 2010 Proxy Statement,

1 Marvell also disclosed that 75% of Sehat Sutardja's compensation was tied to performance of the
 2 Company, and that the performance-based compensation would only be realized if Marvell
 3 achieved performance goals that aligned with the 75th percentile of a peer group of other
 4 companies: "The executive compensation committee approved a target compensation package
 5 for Dr. Sehat Sutardja for fiscal 2011 that aligns with the 75th percentile of the peer group. This
 6 package is intended to have approximately 75% of total compensation value tied to performance,
 7 and will only align with the 75th percentile of the peer group if Dr. Sehat Sutardja achieves
 8 performance conditions." *See* Marvell's 2010 Proxy Statement, at p. 28. In describing why
 9 Marvell's Executive Compensation Committee (Defendants Gromer, Kassakian, and Krueger)
 10 awarded a generous compensation package to Dr. Sehat Sutardja, the Proxy stated that Sutardja
 11 "sets our strategic vision and manages the day-to-day operations of the business. Importantly, he
 12 plays a lead role in mapping our innovation and R&D vision which is foundational to future
 13 shareholder value creation. With over 150 patents, his personal leadership in the advancement of
 14 our technology is critical to achieving our business objectives." *See* Marvell's 2010 Proxy
 15 Statement, at pp. 28-29. This statement was false and misleading because the Proxy did not
 16 reveal that Sutardja's "personal leadership" in the management of the day-to-day operations of
 17 Marvell included willful infringement of the CMU patents, and that far from contributing to
 18 "future shareholder value creation," Sutardja's dishonest and willful patent infringement would
 19 result in the destruction of shareholder value to the tune of over \$1 billion.

20 126. Pantas Sutardja's performance-based awards (options or RSUs) were also
 21 premised on Marvell achieving certain benchmarks. Pantas Sutardja's awards were based on
 22 EPS in 2008 (Marvell had to achieve EPS of \$1.06 or more) and were based on revenue growth
 23 in 2011.

24 127. Pursuant to the formulas and factors set forth in Marvell's Proxy Statements,
 25 defendants Sehat Sutardja, Weili Dai, and Pantas Sutardja were paid the following incentive-
 26 based compensation during the indicated years:
 27
 28

	Position	Fiscal Year	Salary (\$)	Bonus (\$)	Stock Awards (\$)	Securities Underlying Options (#)	Option Awards/ Adj. (\$)	Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation (\$)	All Other Compensation (\$)	Total (\$)
DR. SEHAT SUTARDJA, PH.D.										
1	Chairman, President and CEO	2013	841,346	-	3,040,000	/	8,751,750	-	1,517	12,634,613
2	Chairman, President and CEO	2012	783,076	-	-	/	11,324,040	180,000	283,056	12,570,172
3	Chairman, President and CEO	2011	691,731	1,200,000	6,489,747	/	2,443,275	-	5,186	10,829,939
4	Chairman, President and CEO	2010	657,000	985,000	-	/	-	-	574	1,642,574
5	Chairman, President and CEO	2009	88,443	-	-	/	2,162,230 ¹⁷	-	30,600	2,281,273 ¹⁸
6	Chairman, President and CEO	2008	533,435	-	-	/	7,254,923 ¹⁹	13,500	12,267	7,814,125 ²⁰
7	Chairman, President and CEO	2007	557,000 ²¹	-	/	/	9,704,258	/	25,000	10,286,258 ²²
8										

¹⁷ According to Marvell's 2010 proxy statement, at p.32, the value of these option awards was revised in 2010 to \$1,874,256 to reflect a new grant date fair value in accordance with revised SEC disclosure requirements. The amounts do not represent the actual amounts paid to or realized by the named executive officer.

¹⁸ This total compensation figure was adjusted by Marvell in 2010 to \$1,993,299, as stated in the Company's 2010 proxy statement. The adjustment was again made to conform to new SEC disclosure requirements.

¹⁹ According to Marvell's 2010 proxy statement, at p.32, the value of the option awards was revised to \$2,529,354 to reflect a grant date fair value in accordance with new revised SEC disclosure requirements. The amounts do not represent the actual amounts paid to or realized by the named executive officer.

²⁰ Total compensation adjusted to \$3,088,556 in the 2010 proxy statement to reflect new SEC disclosure rules.

²¹ According to Marvell in their 2008 proxy statement, at p.29, the value was retroactively adjusted to \$566,397 and was made to the executives effective as of January 31, 2006.

²² Total compensation figure was subsequently adjusted by Marvell to \$10,297,155, as stated in the 2008 proxy statement, to reflect new SEC rules.

1	Position	Fiscal Year	Salary (\$)	Bonus (\$)	Stock Awards (\$)	Securities Underlying Options (#)	Option Awards/ Adj. (\$)	Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation (\$)	All Other Compensation (\$)	Total (\$)
2	Chairman, President, CEO	2006	500,000	58,750	/	-	/	/	1,000	
4	Chairman, President and CEO	2005	500,000	36,000	/	-	/	/	500	
6	Chairman, President and CEO	2004	500,000	21,750	/	1,500,000	/	/	-	
7	Co-Chairman of the Board, President, CEO	2003	500,000	13,000	/	200,000	/	/	-	
9	WEILI DAI									
10	President of Marvell Technology Group, Inc.	2013	510,000	-	Option to purchase common shares and RSU ²³	/	-	-	-	
12	Employee of MSI and former Executive VP and COO	2012	510,000	400,000	Option to purchase common shares and RSU ²⁴	/	-	-	-	

²³ According to the 2013 proxy statement, at p.50, the audit committee and executive compensation committee approved the grant to Ms. Dai of (A) an option to purchase 450,000 common shares at fair market value on the date of grant and with service-based vesting 1/3 annually beginning on the second anniversary of the vesting commencement date, which was April 1, 2013, (B) 60,000 RSUs with service-based vesting that vest in full on April 1, 2014, and (C) 100,000 performance-based RSUs based on certain performance metrics for fiscal 2014. The value of such shares and RSU were not provided by Marvell.

²⁴ According to the 2012 proxy statement pg.54, the audit committee and executive compensation committee approved the grant to Ms. Dai of (A) an option to purchase 800,000 common shares at fair market value on the date of grant and with service-based vesting, (B) 80,000 RSUs with service-based vesting. The value of such shares and RSU were not provided by Marvell.

1	Position	Fiscal Year	Salary (\$)	Bonus (\$)	Stock Awards (\$)	Securities Underlying Options (#)	Option Awards/ Adj. (\$)	Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation (\$)	All Other Compensation (\$)	Total (\$)
2	Employee of MSI and former Executive Vice President and COO	2011	500,000	480,000	Option to purchase common shares ²⁵	/	-	-	-	-
3	Employee of MSI and former Executive Vice President and COO	2010	480,000	450,000	Option to purchase 100,000 common shares and 30,000 RSUs as well as a RSU for 236,518 shares ²⁶	/	-	-	-	-
4	Employee of MSI ²⁷ ²⁸	2009	450,000	-	Option to purchase common shares ²⁹	/	-	-	-	-

²⁵ According to the 2011 proxy statement pg.55, the audit committee and executive compensation committee approved the grant to Ms. Dai of (A) an option to purchase 180,000 common shares at fair market value on the date of grant and with time-based vesting, (B) an option to purchase 360,000 common shares, with vesting of the shares conditioned on the achievement of market-based price target for the Company's common shares. The value of such shares and RSU were not provided by Marvell.

²⁶ According to Marvell's 2010 proxy statement, at p.40, the audit committee and executive compensation committee approved the grant to Ms. Dai of (A) an option to purchase 100,000 common shares at fair market value on the date of grant and with time-based vesting, (B) a RSU award for 30,000 common shares with time-based vesting, and (C) RSU award for up to 236,518 common shares, with the number of shares to vest to be subject to the achievement of performance objectives related to growth in revenue of a specific business group in fiscal years 2011 and 2012, subject to a minimum level of such revenue growth over the two-year period. The value of such shares and RSU were not provided by Marvell.

²⁷ Marvell Semiconductor, Inc. ("MSI") is a subsidiary of Marvell Technology Group, Inc.

²⁸ Ms. Dai served as the Vice President of Sales for Communications and Consumer Business, Vice President, General Manager of Communications and Computing Business Unit of MSI.

²⁹ According to the 2009 proxy statement pg.38, Ms. Dai was granted by the executive compensation committee an option to purchase 200,000 common shares at fair market value on the date of grant. The value of such shares and RSU were not provided by Marvell.

	Position	Fiscal Year	Salary (\$)	Bonus (\$)	Stock Awards (\$)	Securities Underlying Options (#)	Option Awards/ Adj. (\$)	Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation (\$)	All Other Compensation (\$)	Total (\$)
1	Employee of MSI ³⁰ and former Executive VP and COO ³¹	2008	280,962	-	-	/	7,387,067	500	3,582	7,672,111
2	Executive Vice President and COO ³²	2007	481,000 ³³	-	/	/	6,888,798	/	4,000	7,373,798 ³⁴
3	COO, Secretary and Director	2006	375,000	250	/	-	/	/	1,000	
4	Executive VP, Secretary and Director	2005	375,000	-	/	-	/	/	500	
5	Executive VP, Secretary and Director	2004	375,000	-	/	1,000,000	/	/	-	
6	Executive VP, Secretary and Director	2003	375,000	250	/	100,000	/	/	-	
7	PANTAS SUTARDJA									
8	VP, Chief Technology Officer and Chief R&D Officer	2013	423,442	-	638,400	/	1,983,730	-	3,517	3,049,089
9	VP, Chief Technology Officer and Chief R&D Officer	2012	413,292	-	-	/	2,426,580	24,960	156,030	3,020,862

³⁰ Ms. Dai transitioned into a position as Director of Strategic Marketing and business Development of MSI. On May 31, 2008, Ms. Dai was appointed as Vice President of Sales for Communications and Consumer Business of MSI.

³¹ Beginning in 2007, Ms. Dai officially resigned from her position as an executive officer of the Company as a result of her settlement agreement with the SEC relating to the options backdating scandal at Marvell. The SEC settlement barred Dai from serving as an executive officer of Marvell for five (5) years. However, Dai immediately was given a high-level position with Marvell and/or MSI, although the exact nature of her job title and role at Marvell was not disclosed in Marvell's proxy statements.

³² Ms. Dai resigned as Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer and from the board of directors on May 6, 2007.

³³ According to Marvell in their 2008 proxy statement pg.29, the value has been retroactively adjusted to \$487,802 and was made to the executives effective as of January 31, 2006.

³⁴ Total compensation adjusted to \$7,380,600 as stated in the 2008 proxy statement.

	Position	Fiscal Year	Salary (\$)	Bonus (\$)	Stock Awards (\$)	Securities Underlying Options (#)	Option Awards/ Adj. (\$)	Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation (\$)	All Other Compensation (\$)	Total (\$)
1	VP, Chief Technology Officer and Chief R&D Officer	2011	400,000	180,000	446,794	/	488,655	-	2,990	1,518,439
2	Technology Officer and Chief R&D Officer	2010	400,000	160,000	-	/	-	-	38,113	598,113
3	VP, Chief Technology Officer and Chief R&D Officer	2009	53,847	-	-	/	1,181,290 ³⁵	-	1,384	1,236,521 ³⁶
4	VP, Chief Technology Officer, Acting Chief Operating Officer, Chief R&D Officer	2008	383,077	-	-	/	3,157,548 ³⁷	24,500	2,017	3,567,142 ³⁸
5	Chief Technology Officer	2007	400,000 ³⁹	-	/	/	4,652,587	/	34,000	5,086,587 ⁴⁰
6	Chief Technology Officer and Director	2006	300,000	10,250	/	-	/	/	/	1,000
7	Chief Technology Officer and Director	2005	300,000	30,000	/	-	/	/	/	500

³⁵ In 2010, according to Marvell's 2010 proxy statement, at pg.32, Marvell revised the reported value of the option awards to \$312,168 to reflect a new grant date fair value in accordance with revised SEC disclosure requirements. As is stated in the Proxy Statements, the amounts do not represent the actual amounts paid to or realized by the named executive officer.

³⁶ In 2010, according to Marvell's 2010 proxy statement, at pg.32, Marvell revised the reported value of Dai's total 2009 compensation to \$367,399, again to reflect new SEC disclosure requirements regarding executive compensation.

³⁷ According to Marvell in their 2010 proxy statement pg.32, the value of the option awards has been revised to \$1,073,993 to reflect grant date fair value in accordance with the revised SEC disclosure requirements. The amounts do not represent the actual amounts paid to or realized by the named executive officer.

³⁸ Total compensation adjusted to \$1,483,587 as stated in the 2010 proxy statement.

³⁹ According to Marvell in their 2008 proxy statement pg.29, the value has been retroactively adjusted to \$405,385 and was made to the executives effective as of January 31, 2006.

⁴⁰ Total compensation adjusted to \$5,091,972 as stated in the 2008 proxy statement.

1	Position	Fiscal Year	Salary (\$)	Bonus (\$)	Stock Awards (\$)	Securities Underlying Options (#)	Option Awards/ Adj. (\$)	Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation (\$)	All Other Compensation (\$)	Total (\$)
2	Chief Technology Officer and Director	2004	300,000	18,000	/	660,000	/	/	-	-
3	VP and Director	2003	300,000	1,500	/	100,000	/	/	-	-

8 128. A substantial portion of this compensation was unjust and unearned because these
 9 individual defendants caused Marvell to willfully infringe CMU's patents. But for the willful
 10 infringement of CMU's patents, Marvell's revenues, earnings per share, and profit margins (both
 11 on an absolute basis and compared to its peers) would have been substantially lower. In the
 12 CMU litigation, CMU expert witness Lawton demonstrated, and the jury agreed, that Marvell
 13 realized an excess profit per infringed chip of between \$0.06 and \$.72. It was stipulated by the
 14 parties at trial that Marvell sold 2,338,280,543 chips which infringed CMU's patents from March
 15 6, 2003 through the date of the trial in December 2012. The average price per chip was \$4.42
 16 and the operating profit per chip was \$2.16, based on Marvell's sales data produced at trial.
 17 Expert witness Lawton calculated the excess profit per infringed chip of between \$0.06 and \$.72
 18 by looking at both the sales data and then comparing same to Marvell's gross margin, operating
 19 income and excess profits from 2000 to 2013 of the chips that were sold by Marvell which
 20 infringed CMU's patents (the MNP and NLD chips), and found that Marvell made
 21 approximately a 59.6% profit on its gross margins. Based on this data and these calculations,
 22 Lawton concluded that Marvell received \$0.42 of "excess profits" from its sales of the chips.
 23 Relying in part on her calculations of the excess profits benchmark of \$0.42 per unit, and the
 24 operating profit benchmark of \$0.06 to \$0.72 per unit, and considering other relevant factors,
 25 Lawton opined that a reasonable royalty that Marvell should have paid CMU was \$0.50 per chip.
 26 The jury agreed with Ms. Lawton, CMU's expert, and awarded CMU \$1.17 billion in damages.
 27

1 129. This data and evidence is sufficient to demonstrate that Marvell's earnings,
2 revenues, profits and profit margins, earnings per share, and other metrics were materially
3 inflated during the relevant time period. As a result, the performance-based compensation
4 awarded by Marvell (acting through the Executive Compensation Committee, composed of
5 Defendants Gromer, Kassakian, and Krueger) to Defendants Sehat and Pantas Sutardja, and to
6 Weili Dai, was excessive, unearned, unjust, and inequitable. Not only did such Defendants not
7 earn the performance-based compensation, but they procured it through dishonesty, fraud, and
8 willful infringement of CMU's patents. As a result, it would be inequitable for them to retain the
9 compensation, and such compensation should be returned to Marvell.

10 130. Marvell's policy regarding recoupment of bonuses following a restatement also
11 supports the fact that the above-referenced compensation is unjust, unearned, and should be
12 returned. Marvell has a policy that its CEO and CFO should return bonuses if the company
13 restates its financial results and the bonuses would have been lower taking into consideration the
14 restatement, and if the disinterested members of the Board determine that the restatement was
15 caused in whole or part by gross recklessness or intentional misconduct of the CEO or CFO. This
16 policy acknowledges that it would be inequitable for the Company's officers to retain bonuses or
17 other compensation that would not have been earned, or which would have been lower, due to
18 reckless or intentional misconduct by the officer. This policy supports disgorgement or return of
19 the compensation of Sehat and Pantas Sutardja and Weili Dai. The CMU judgment constitutes a
20 de facto restatement of Marvell's financial results since the \$1.17 billion judgment, as indicated
21 *supra*, was based directly on damages calculations by CMU's expert which demonstrated that
22 Marvell achieved artificially high profits, revenues, and earnings per share directly as a result of
23 its sales of the infringed chips.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28

DEFENDANTS' CONDUCT THREATENS THE PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS TO MARVELL'S CURRENT SHAREHOLDERS

131. In May 2012, Marvell announced the initiation of paying its first quarterly dividend of \$0.06 per share. Marvell's board of directors declared quarterly cash dividends of \$0.06 per share payable to holders of its common shares in each quarter of fiscal 2014 and in each of the last three quarters of fiscal 2013. As a result, Marvell paid cash dividends of \$29.9 million in the three months ended February 1, 2014, and during fiscal 2014 and 2013, Marvell paid a total of \$119.4 million and \$98.8 million, respectively.

132. On February 24, 2014, however, Marvell filed the following Form 8-K with the SEC disclosing that the CMU judgment has impaired or may impair its ability to pay future dividends to its shareholders:

“On February 20, 2014, Marvell announced that it had declared the payment of its quarterly dividend of \$0.06 per share to be paid on March 27, 2014 to all shareholders of record as of March 13, 2014. Developments in the CMU litigation could affect Marvell’s ability to pay the dividend on March 27, 2014 under Bermuda law, where Marvell is incorporated. In such event, the payment of the dividend could be delayed until such time as Marvell can meet statutory requirements under Bermuda law. The payment of future quarterly cash dividends is subject to, among other things, the best interests of its shareholders, its results of operations, cash balances and future cash requirements, financial condition, statutory requirements of Bermuda law, and other factors that the board of directors may deem relevant.”

133. On August 19, 2010, a year after being sued by CMU, the Individual Defendants caused Marvell to embark on a \$500 million stock repurchase plan. In short order, as the CMU litigation progressed, the Individual Defendants caused Marvell to quadruple the size of the plan to \$2 billion. By May 2012, Marvell had repurchased \$1.7 billion of the \$2 billion authorized repurchases. On May 17, 2012, Marvell authorized another \$500 million in repurchases of its own stock in a press release issued from its headquarters in Santa Clara, CA which stated:

“Marvell has repurchased approximately \$1.7 billion of its previously authorized \$2 billion program leaving about \$348 million remaining in the current repurchase

1 program. With the new \$500 million authorization the total repurchase program
 2 increases to \$2.5 billion and the amount remaining to \$848 million. Marvell has
 3 repurchased and retired over 107 million shares, or about 16 percent, of the
 4 outstanding shares since the initial announcement of the share repurchase program
 5 in August 2010.”

6 134. Analysts have been critical of the stock repurchase plan. Many have noted
 7 that its announcement coincided with the CMU litigation.

8 135. On December 18, 2012, as the CMU litigation was nearing its end, the
 9 Individual Defendants caused Marvell to increase the share repurchases by another \$500
 10 million.

11 136. The massive increases in the share repurchase program represents a direct
 12 risk to, and infringement of, the shareholders’ potential dividends. If Marvell is forced to
 13 pay the CMU judgment, there will not be sufficient cash reserves at Marvell to pay
 14 dividends. The defendants’ wrongful conduct thus has caused damage to the personal
 15 rights of Plaintiff and the Class.

16 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

17 137. Plaintiff brings this action on his own behalf and as a class action pursuant to
 18 F.R.C.P. 23 on behalf of all holders of Marvell stock who are being and will be harmed by
 19 defendants’ actions described below (the “Class”). Excluded from the Class are
 20 defendants herein and any person, firm, trust, corporation, or other entity related to or
 21 affiliated with any defendant.

22 138. This action is properly maintainable as a class action.

23 139. The Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.
 24 According to Marvell’s SEC filings, there were 503.4 million shares of Marvell common
 25 stock outstanding as of March 20, 2014.

140. There are questions of law and fact which are common to the Class and which predominate over questions affecting any individual Class member. The common questions include, *inter alia*, the following:

(a) whether defendants have breached their fiduciary duties of undivided loyalty, independence or due care with respect to Plaintiff and the other members of the Class as a result of their conduct with respect to the CMU's patents and the CMU litigation;

(b) whether defendants' conduct has benefitted themselves to the detriment of Plaintiff and the Class;

(c) whether defendants' conduct threatens the dividends to be declared and paid to Plaintiff and the Class;

(d) whether defendants have breached any of their other fiduciary duties to Plaintiff and the other members of the Class in connection with their handling of the CMU patents and CMU litigation, including the duties of good faith, diligence, candor and fair dealing; and

(f) whether Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to declaratory, injunctive, and/or monetary relief, and if so the appropriate form and/or amount of such relief.

141. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the other members of the Class and Plaintiff does not have any interests adverse to the Class.

142. Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the Class, has retained competent counsel experienced in litigation of this nature and will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class

143. The prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Class would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the party opposing the Class.

1 144. Plaintiff anticipates that there will be no difficulty in the management of this
2 litigation. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient
3 adjudication of this controversy.

4 145. Defendants have acted on grounds generally applicable to the Class with
5 respect to the matters complained of herein, thereby making appropriate the relief sought
6 herein with respect to the Class as a whole.

DERIVATIVE ALLEGATIONS

8 146. Plaintiff also brings this action derivatively for the benefit of Marvell to
9 redress injuries suffered, and yet to be suffered, by Marvell as a direct and proximate result
10 of the Individual Defendants' breaches of fiduciary duty, violations of California
11 Corporations Code, waste of corporate assets and unjust enrichment. Marvell is named in
12 this action as a Nominal Defendant solely in a derivative capacity.

13 147. Plaintiff is a current Marvell shareholder and has continuously held Marvell
14 stock at all relevant times.

148. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the Company
149 and has retained competent counsel, experienced in derivative litigation, to enforce and
150 prosecute this action.

18 149. This action is not a collusive one to confer jurisdiction on a court that it
19 would not otherwise have.

I. THE DERIVATIVE CLAIMS ARE AUTHORIZED UNDER FOSS V. HARBOTTLE BECAUSE DEFENDANTS' WRONDOING HAS INFRINGED UPON THE SHAREHOLDERS' PERSONAL RIGHTS AND BECAUSE DEFENDANTS' CONDUCT WAS *ULTRA VIRES*

23 150. Marvell is a Bermuda corporation. Bermuda follows the *Foss v. Harbottle*
24 decision, 2 Hare 461 (Eng. 1843), in determining the circumstances under which a
25 company's shareholders may maintain a derivative action. Under *Foss v. Harbottle*, a
26 derivative action may be maintained if the individual defendants' wrongdoing infringes

1 upon the personal rights of the company's shareholders, as opposed to rights belonging to
 2 the company itself.

3 151. Here, the Individual Defendants' fraud has infringed upon the shareholders'
 4 personal rights because it has jeopardized the shareholders' expectations and right to
 5 dividends. Dividends belong to the shareholders, not the corporation. Thus, wrongdoing
 6 which impairs the company's ability to declare and pay dividends infringes on the
 7 shareholders' personal rights.

8 152. On February 24, 2014 Marvell filed the following Form 8-K with the SEC
 9 disclosing that the CMU judgment has impaired or may impair its ability to pay future
 10 dividends to its shareholders:

11 "On February 20, 2014, Marvell announced that it had declared the payment of its
 12 quarterly dividend of \$0.06 per share to be paid on March 27, 2014 to all
 13 shareholders of record as of March 13, 2014. Developments in the CMU litigation
 14 could affect Marvell's ability to pay the dividend on March 27, 2014 under
 15 Bermuda law, where Marvell is incorporated. In such event, the payment of the
 16 dividend could be delayed until such time as Marvell can meet statutory
 17 requirements under Bermuda law. The payment of future quarterly cash dividends
 18 is subject to, among other things, the best interests of its shareholders, its results
 19 of operations, cash balances and future cash requirements, financial condition,
 20 statutory requirements of Bermuda law, and other factors that the board of
 21 directors may deem relevant."

22 153. A shareholder derivative action is also authorized under the facts of the
 23 present case because the defendants' conduct constitutes *ultra vires* acts, which is another
 24 specific exception under *Foss v. Harbottle* permitting a derivative claim. The directors
 25 and officers of Marvell were not permitted under Marvell's Memorandum of Association⁴¹
 26 and bylaws to willfully infringe CMU's patents. Because they did so under circumstances
 27 constituting fraud and dishonesty, their conduct constituted *ultra vires* action.

28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41 41 Marvell's Memorandum of Association is the functional equivalent of Articles of
 42 Incorporation.

154. The defendants also acted *illegally and unlawfully* by causing the Company to willfully infringe patents owned by CMU, subjecting the Company to a judgment in excess of \$1.54 billion.

155. The defendants also acted in a *dishonest manner* because they lied to Marvell's shareholders about the Company's infringement of CMU's patent, as alleged specifically *supra*.

156. The defendants also acted in a *dishonest manner* because they engaged in self-dealing. By willfully infringing CMU's patent and wrongfully refusing to pay royalties and/or licensing fees to CMU for the patent, the defendants artificially increased Marvell's stock price and reported revenues and earnings. As a result, and as detailed in this complaint, the defendants wrongfully appropriated to themselves salaries, incentive-based compensation, stock, stock options, bonuses, and other benefits which were unjust, unearned, inequitable, and which should be returned to the Company. Through their actions, and with intent to benefit themselves at the expense of the Company and its shareholders, the defendants engaged in self-dealing and acting dishonestly, thus breaching their duties of good faith, fair dealing, honesty and candor.

157. Marvell may not indemnify the Individual Defendants for their wrongdoing since the wrongdoing involves dishonesty and/or fraud, as those terms are used under Bermuda law. Article 30 of Bermuda's Third Amended and Restated Bye-laws specifically states that Marvell may not indemnify any of its officers or directors for "fraud or dishonesty which may attach to any of said persons."

COUNT I

158. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained above as if fully set forth herein.

1 159. The Individual Defendants owed and owe Marvell fiduciary obligations. By
2 reason of their fiduciary relationships, the Individual Defendants owed and owe Marvell
3 the highest obligation of good faith, fair dealing, loyalty and due care. Under Bermuda
4 law, all of Marvell's officers and directors, in exercising their powers and discharging their
5 duties, must act honestly and in good faith with a view to Marvell's best interests and
6 exercise the care, diligence and skill that a reasonably prudent person would exercise in
7 comparable circumstances.

8 160. The Individual Defendants violated their fiduciary duties of care, loyalty,
9 and good faith, and acted in a dishonest manner, by engaging in one or more of the
10 following acts: (a) causing or allowing the Company to willfully infringe patents held by
11 CMU; (b) disseminating to Marvell shareholders materially misleading and inaccurate
12 information through, *inter alia*, SEC filings, press releases, and other public statements
13 and disclosures as detailed herein; (c) approving or receiving compensation which was
14 unjust and unearned because the compensation was based on revenues, earnings and
15 profits which were inflated due to Marvell’s willful infringement of CMU’s patents; and
16 (d) failing to reasonably settle the CMU litigation once liability became apparent. Further,
17 each of the Individual Defendants failed to correct the Company’s publicly reported
18 financial results and guidance. These actions could not have been a good faith exercise of
19 prudent business judgment.

161. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' foregoing breaches of fiduciary duties, the Company has sustained significant damages, as alleged herein.

COUNT II
AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS FOR BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY FOR
FAILING TO MAINTAIN ADEQUATE INTERNAL CONTROLS

25 162. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation
26 set forth above, as though fully set forth herein.

1 163. As alleged herein, each of the Defendants had a fiduciary duty to, *inter alia*,
2 exercise good faith to ensure that the Company had adequate internal controls. One of the most
3 important internal controls at Marvell concerned patents and ensuring that Marvell did not
4 infringe others' intellectual property and patents. As demonstrated in the CMU litigation,
5 Marvell did not have effective internal controls concerning patents and/or did not follow its own
6 internal policies concerning investigation of patents when it received notice of CMU's patents.
7 Its failure to follow its own internal policies, or perform any investigation as to whether it was
8 violated CMU's patents, was one of the reasons the jury found willful infringement by Marvell.

9 164. The Individual Defendants willfully ignored the obvious and pervasive problems
10 with Marvell's internal controls and procedures and failed to make a good faith effort to correct
11 the problems or prevent their recurrence.

12 165. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' foregoing breaches of
13 fiduciary duties, the Company has sustained significant damages, as alleged herein.

COUNT III
AGAINST DEFENDANTS SEHAT SUTARDJA, PANTAS SUTARDJA, AND
WEILI DAI FOR UNJUST ENRICHMENT

17 166. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation
18 set forth above, as though fully set forth herein.

19 167. By their wrongful acts and omissions, Defendants Sehat Sutardja, Pantas
20 Sutardja, and Weili Dai were unjustly enriched at the expense, and to the detriment, of
21 Marvell.

22 168. Plaintiff, as a shareholder and representative of Marvell, seeks restitution
23 from such Defendants, and each of them, and seeks an order of this Court disgorging all
24 profits, benefits and other compensation obtained by such Defendants, and each of them,
25 from their wrongful conduct and fiduciary breaches.

26 169. Plaintiff, on behalf of Marvell, has no adequate remedy at law.

COUNT IV
AGAINST DEFENDANTS SEHAT AND PANTAS SUTARDJA AND WEILI DAI
FOR BREACH OF DUTY OF HONEST SERVICES

170. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

171. This claim is brought derivatively on behalf of the Company against Defendants Sehat Sutardja, Pantas Sutardja, and Weili Dai for breach of their undivided duty of loyalty to their employer, Marvell.

172. Sehat and Pantas Sutardja and Weili Dai were employees of Marvell.

173. As alleged above, Sehat and Pantas Sutardja and Weili Dai breached their duty of loyalty to Marvell by not acting solely in Marvell's interests in performing their employment duties.

174. Those breaches of duty consisted of the conduct alleged throughout this complaint including, without limitation, Defendants' causing the Company to willfully infringe patents held by CMU, causing the Company to make false statements to the market that misrepresented the Company's patents, compliance with the law, business and financial prospects and by direct participation in willfully infringing CMU's patents. Sehat and Pantas Sutardja and Weili Dai benefitted from their wrongdoing because they received compensation that was directly tied to the company's financial performance.

175. Marvell was harmed by these Defendants' breaches of their undivided duty of loyalty.

176. By reason of the foregoing, Marvell was harmed and will continue to suffer harm as described in greater detail above.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief, as follows:

A. A judgment against all Defendants and in favor of the Company for the amount of damages sustained by the Company as a result of the Individual Defendants' breaches of fiduciary duties and other wrongdoing;

B. Directing Marvell to take all necessary actions to reform and improve its corporate governance and internal procedures to comply with applicable laws and to protect Marvell and its shareholders from a repeat of the damaging events described herein, including, but not limited to, putting forward for shareholder vote resolutions for amendments to the Company's By-Laws or Articles of Incorporation and taking such other action as may be necessary to place before shareholders for a vote the following Corporate Governance Policies:

- a proposal to strengthen the Board's supervision of operations and develop and implement procedures for greater shareholder input into the policies and guidelines of the Board;
- a proposal to strengthen the Company's internal controls over patent laws and procedures to be followed to ensure that the Company does not infringe patents held by others;
- a provision to permit the shareholders of Marvell to nominate at least two candidates for election to the Board; and
- a proposal to strengthen the Company's procedures for the receipt, retention and treatment of complaints received by the Company regarding patent, accounting, internal controls and auditing matters.

C. Extraordinary equitable and/or injunctive relief as permitted by law and equity;

D. Awarding to Marvell restitution from the Defendants, and each of them, and ordering disgorgement of all profits, benefits and other compensation obtained by the Defendants due to the willful infringement of CMU's patents;

E. Awarding to Plaintiff the costs and disbursements of the action, including reasonable attorneys' fees, accountants' and experts' fees, costs, and expenses; and

F. Granting such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all claims so triable.

1 Dated : June 2, 2014

Respectfully submitted,
2 BOTTINI & BOTTINI, INC.
3 Francis A. Bottini, Jr. (SBN 175783)
Albert Y. Chang (SBN 296065)
Yury A. Kolesnikov (SBN: 271173)

4 /s/ Francis A. Bottini, Jr.

5 Francis A. Bottini, Jr.

6 7817 Ivanhoe Avenue, Suite 102
7 La Jolla, California 92037
8 Telephone: (858) 914-2001
Facsimile: (858) 914-2002
9 E-mail: fbottini@bottinilaw.com
achang@bottinilaw.com
ykolesnikov@bottinilaw.com

10
11 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

VERIFICATION

I, Sebastiano D'Arrigo, verify that I am a shareholder of Marvell Technology Group, Ltd. (the "Company"). I have reviewed the allegations made in this Complaint. As to those allegations of which I have personal knowledge, I believe them to be true; as to those allegations of which I lack personal knowledge, I rely upon my counsel and counsel's investigation, and believe them to be true. Having received a copy of the Complaint and reviewed it with counsel, I authorize its filing.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: May 23, 2014


Sebastiano D'Arrigo